The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VII | New York, Saturday, June 10, 1916 | Number 84

Contents

Editorial Notes 129
Leading Editorials
- Sovereign Mexico 132
- The Close of the Brandeis Case 134
- Philippine Independence 135
- Doubtful Voters 136

General Articles
- Labor and the Call to Arms ..... Malcolm W. Davis 137
- Whitman's Idea of the State ..... Percy H. Boynton 139
- Germany and the Monroe Doctrine ..... M. J. Bonn 141
- Continuation Schools ..... Randolph Bourne 143
- Must We Have Her? ..... Elsie Clews Parsons 145

Correspondence 146
Verse 148
Reviews of Books
- The Meekness of May 150
- Secret Diplomacy ..... B. F. 151
- Half-Preparedness ..... W. L. 152
- Germany Defended 154

IF Lord Kitchener had been killed during the first few months of the war his death would have been felt as a terrible calamity by the English people. Their list of generals and statesmen contained no satisfactory substitute. The new English army was Kitchener's army. The nation was depending on him to prepare for war, after war had taken place, and to organize victory. The death of the same man sixteen months later is a deplorable accident, a sharp reminder of the indiscriminate hazards of a war conducted with mines, torpedoes and Zeppelins; but it is not a serious calamity. During the intervening period the English have learned one or two things. Their original reliance on Lord Kitchener was a confession of weakness. They turned to him as the only man who was capable of improvising a national military organization. He was to be the creative military dictator, who in a few months would make up for all past negligence and turn out an army as well equipped, munitioned, trained, officered and directed as that of the Germans. It is no condemnation of Lord Kitchener to say that he failed. He did all that one man can be expected to do. Success in a modern war cannot be manufactured in the brain of one man. A modern military organization cannot be improvised. At its best it is the consummate example of sheer administration, and depends for its success upon the coöperative effort of many minds, unified by a common purpose and enlightened by antecedent training and knowledge. The work which Lord Kitchener tried to do alone was gradually distributed among many people. The English will not find a substitute for him, not because no substitute is available, not because Lord Kitchener has made a substitute unnecessary, but because they have come to realize the futility of trusting the organization of victory to a Napoleon of the War Office.

YUAN SHIH KAI was the strongest man in China. Chinese officialdom worships phrases and scampers when confronted by responsibility. Yuan dared to act. He was unscrupulous himself. He used and was in turn used by men who had more intelligence and less character. Yuan must be judged, however, not by our standards but in comparison with his fellow countrymen. He was a great man. Twice he reorganized the Chinese government—once after the Boxer troubles of 1900 and again after the Revolution of 1911. The latter task was nearing completion, his power was supreme, when last autumn spurred on by the crazy ambition of his advisers and his eldest son, he decided to proclaim himself Emperor. He had the substance but he desired the shadow as well. Smouldering revolutionary activity burst out anew in the south. Japan, with the support of the Allied Powers, urged China not to change her form of government. Yuan yielded and his power was broken. He was ill advised in attempting to assume the imperial title. His enemies thwarted what may have been his wicked ambition, but in doing so they have thrown their country under the control of Japan. Yuan may have died a natural death. It is more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probable that he was assassinated and that old scores have been settled. Those who believe that Yuan betrayed the Emperor Kuang Hsu and the Reform party in 1898, those who believe that he sold himself to the foreigners in 1900, those who feel that he proved unfaithful to his trust by forsaking the Manchus to secure the dictatorship in 1912, those who consider that he proved false to his oath when he attempted to assume the imperial title, will all consider his life a just forfeit. They may be right but, we repeat, Yuan was the strongest man in China.

THERE is nothing, absolutely nothing, on the record to prove that Mr. Justice Hughes did any gloating over the effect of his little speech upon the leaders and other delegates at Chicago, yet it is difficult not to suppose that he chuckled. First came the report that Mr. Hughes had broken silence. There was a rush for the tickers and the newsboys. The report was, strange to say, correct. Mr. Hughes had spoken. He had spoken about the American flag. With flushed cheeks and beating hearts the delegates read his words. The flag, he said, "is the symbol of our national unity, our national strength, our national aspiration." The flag, he said, "means America first; it means an undivided allegiance, it means America united, strong and efficient, equal to her tasks." National unity — America united — America first! Such phrases sound like the beginning of a declaration of political faith, yet what they actually led to was this: "With these thoughts, and in token of the first rank in scholarship, which you have equally attained, I give to you, Isabel Ringelhaupt and Margaret Wiese, jointly the flag which during the past year has floated over the National Cathedral School." One of the Republican leaders was heard to murmur, as the extra fell from his hands: "Ah, what a dusty answer gets the soul when hot for certainties in this our life."

DURING the past week, in addition to the conventions of the Republican and Progressive parties, there have been held in Chicago one or two national assemblages of women politicians. These conventions of women have not received much attention. The reports have been meagre and have been dismissed to obscure portions of the papers. But in relation to them we venture to make a prophecy. Four years from now the nation will be watching another convention of the Republican if not of the Progressive party. There will be assembled at the same time and place a supplementary convention of women politicians; but in 1920 the news of their performances will not be dismissed to the sixth page. They will be promoted to somewhere near the first. These conventions of women held, not as in the past for the purpose of consultation, but rather to influence the course of American politics, are only in their infancy. As the number of women voters increases, and as their political self-consciousness is intensified, women will assemble in conventions, as men do, less to utter pious opinions than to exercise power for the accomplishment of purposes. The men politicians will find this increasing intrusion of women as a separate organized force into party politics very inconvenient, but in the long run there is only one way in which it can be avoided. Women will assemble in separate conventions as long as they have separate political grievances. The only way to prevent some women from a sex-regarding exercise of their power as voters is to give to all of them the vote. From now on they will hold separate conventions until they are admitted into the regular party conventions on complete equality with men.

BY this time nearly everybody has exercised his right to say that the first great naval battle of the war has left England where it found her, namely, in absolute control of the seas, with the blockade as tight as ever. This is obviously true, and it is just as obviously an inadequate account of the total effect of the battle. Nobody can read the reports still coming from Germany without feeling that the elation in that country is genuine. Nobody has read the successive English reports without fresh wonder at the ability of the English as self-persuaders. The fact remains that the first news of the battle was received with dismay, and that this first feeling corresponded to the realities. Owing to its own skill the German High Seas fleet, after inflicting greater damage than it suffered upon an inferior British force, retreated when the British force became superior. If Sir David Beatty had been reinforced earlier, if the British dreadnoughts had been fewer hours behind him, the Germans would probably have retired before either suffering or inflicting heavy losses. Who can doubt that the British naval authorities would have preferred such a result to what has actually occurred? British naval prestige would be higher at this moment if the battle had not been fought at all.

AN intolerable situation is brought to a climax by the arrests of Mr. Bolton Hall and Miss Ida Rauh in New York for giving information on birth control. The law is framed ostensibly to prevent the purveying of indecent and pornographic matter, but it incidentally prohibits giving information about the prevention of conception—even by those qualified to give it or to those qualified to receive it. A large proportion of well-to-do mar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ried people know about birth control and are at liberty to decide whether they shall practise it or not. They do not consider the knowledge indecent or pornographic, and they would feel injured if they were not allowed to submit the question to private judgment. Yet this liberty of conscience is denied by the state, with the consequence that the more ignorant masses cannot exercise it. Whatever one may think of the advisability of birth control, there can be only one democratic opinion about such legal hypocrisy. Let the question be settled on its merits, not by obscurantism and compulsion. It is not fair to ask the police and the courts to enforce, or public-spirited citizens to challenge, a law denying important knowledge which the more fortunate part of the community already possesses. If we desire to prohibit birth control by law, we should make a law regulating conduct rather than knowledge, and it should apply to every one alike.

TAMPICO oil producers may have legitimate grievances against the Mexican military authorities. But the action of the authorities in attempting to force an advance in wages, even beyond the level agreed upon between employer and employee, does not constitute a legitimate grievance. The Mexican wage earner has been reduced to desperate circumstances by the depreciation of the currency. A peso to-day will buy hardly a quarter of the necessaries of life it commanded six months ago. Money wages should have increased fourfold; as a fact, they have in many instances not advanced at all. This sluggish movement of wages is a phenomenon common to periods of depreciating currency in every country, and if the Mexican authorities can mend matters by forcing up wages by law, it is their plain duty to do so.

FOR every bill killed in Congress intentionally and with malice, ten die of sheer neglect or of solicitous love. A promising measure is introduced, is coddled, petted, plastered over with encomiums and endorsements, and in the end fails to be acted upon. Just such a fate threatens the Kern-McGillicuddy bill, providing uniform workmen's compensation for all injured employees of the United States. It is a good bill, as complete, scientific and adequate as the existing law is partial, unscientific and inadequate. The bill has been introduced nine times in House and Senate, has had three public hearings, has been endorsed by employers, workmen, economists, lawyers and civic associations, and has met nowhere with open opposition. It has twice been reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee. But it gets no further. It is never called up. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee, who is a southern Democrat, does not believe much in compensation. Or perhaps he does not believe in the Democratic platform, which explicitly promises the passage of just such a bill. In another week the Democrats will be exchanging old pledges for new. But the new will have an easier currency if the old are honorably fulfilled.

A SCHOOL which is to be started at the University of Oregon indicates that the far West has not lost its former ability to act on new ideas. One of the departments in that institution is proposing to organize a school which shall specially prepare its students for the service of the state. The plan is the outcome of a series of conferences on the fundamental political and social problems of Oregon, which have been held during the past eight years by members of the department of economics and sociology. The object of these conferences has been to enable the University to participate in the organization and direction of the local progressive, social and political movement. But the instructors in the two departments have regarded this work as only the introduction to the larger plan of a "School for Commonwealth Service"—a school "wherein the social obligations laid upon the institution are definitely and gladly accepted and wherein students are to be furnished with facts and technical training which will enable them to leave the university informed as to their social duty and equipped to perform it." The originators of this program propose to work in two different directions. They propose to organize a training school for public servants, which will afford opportunities for the study of administrative problems and methods in the public offices; and they will work also towards the socializing of the various special disciplines through which the student must pass in order to enter the several professions. The second of these experiments looks somewhat nebulous and dubious; but there can be no doubt about the need and the value of the first.

IN order to do their job properly however, state training schools in public administration should be supplemented by a national school, situated in Washington. The national school should be in the highest and best sense of the word a political university—one in which graduate students in political science from all the state schools could pursue advanced courses and which would send its pupils into the public departments to obtain experience and make studies in the practical work of administration. The partial model for such a university can already be observed in the French "École Libre des Sciences Politiques," which was started in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris after the disaster of the Franco-Prussian war as one means of giving vitality to French popular political institutions. It is a singular commentary on the limitations of American educational ideas that in spite of the enormous sums dedicated by Americans to education, such a school has not as yet been founded in this country. The lack of it is all the more singular because in the minds of most American educational benefactors our democratic political institutions were the sufficient excuse for making such a generous provision for education. A national school of public administration will be started as soon as Americans seriously begin to prepare for the fulfillment of their own national ideals.

"I HAVE no objection to being cleaned up in reason, but if I had to choose, I had rather be human and dirty than inhuman and clean." Why choose? At what point does cleanliness cease to be human? Perhaps where it adjoins godliness. Yet this can hardly have been the meaning of the venerable Archdeacon Hudson Stuck of Alaska. Nor can his words be reminiscent of the petulant small boy who is told to wash his hands before eating. Let us dig further. "I have always had a sort of dread of trained sociologists, of anthropologists. . . . With their experimental laboratories, their card indexes . . . they are always in danger of evacuating the human personal element out of their work and thinking of men and women in algebraic formulæ. . . . As soon as philanthropy becomes professionalized. . . it no longer evokes gratitude." Evidently the Archdeacon would rather practise personal benevolence than wash the reluctant or keep a card index. So would almost anyone. But is he quite fair to those who choose heroically to do permanent service for the unfortunate rather than enjoy the luxury of private charity? The warfare of science against dirt and disease is no less honorable because it is laborious and plodding. No matter how inhuman a small boy may regard being cleaned, it is sometimes more important to wash him than to win his gratitude.

ANYBODY who owns a book of quotations is tempted, almost as often as he hears a baccalaureate sermon, to quote these words from Charles Lamb: "A puritanical obtuseness of sentiment, a stupid infantile goodness, is creeping among us." Yet to turn off even a passable baccalaureate sermon is so difficult that much is annually forgiven the preachers. On the list of forgivable sins are platitude, routine laments for the good old times, routine sarcasm, routine playfulness, virtue of both the sawdusty and the watery variety. But historical inaccuracy is unforgivable, especially in a college president. That is why we cannot forgive the Reverend Charles Alexander Raymond, president of Union College, for saying something like this to the graduating class at Vassar: "'Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever' used to be quoted on such occasions as this. Now we say, 'Be clever and let who will be good.'" We challenge the historical accuracy of this statement. The passion for cleverness is nowhere near so devastating as it was about twenty years ago, in the nineties, when ambitious persons tried to write dialogue as smart as Oscar Wilde's, and less ambitious persons tried to write dialogue as smart as Ellen Thorneycroft Fowler's. For one youngster who goes in for cleverness nowadays you will find ten who go in for naturalism, symbolism or vers libre, for liberty or uplift.

THE NEW REPUBLIC regrets that it attributed to Mr. Frank H. Simonds a New York *Tribune* editorial which criticized President Wilson's speech of May 27th at the dinner of the League to Enforce Peace. The editorial was not written by Mr. Simonds, to whom we offer our sincere apologies.

Sovereign Mexico

THE administration has its own record to thank for the ambiguities and the difficulties which arise from the occupation by an American army of the Mexican border states. The demand for immediate withdrawal is entirely justified on the principles which are supposed to determine the President's Mexican policy. He has been pretending to treat Mexico as a wholly independent sovereign state, which is fully entitled to manage its own affairs without outside interference. The pretense has become absurd. The presence of General Pershing's troops on Mexican soil is manifestly a violation of Mexican sovereignty. They crossed the frontier without the unequivocal written consent of the Mexican government. As long as they remain they constitute a flagrant menace to Mexican liberty. Any nation which valued its own independence would resent their presence just as the First Chief is now doing. Any nation whose sovereignty was still intact would either expel them by force or at least resist to the full extent of its ability the violation of its territory. As it is, Carranza is resentful without daring to resist. The administration continues its illegal violation of Mexican territory without being able to find any sufficient defense for its behavior in its professed principles. The situation is rapidly becoming a stalemate. All the efficient force is on one side and all the apparent right on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other. Carranza cannot be expected to break out of the circle, because the abandonment of his principles or the attempt to enforce them would be equally fatal to his government. But President Wilson can break out. He can frankly declare that Mexican sovereignty, instead of being wholly intact, is a legal fiction, which should no longer be allowed to determine the policy of the United States towards Mexico, and consequently of Mexico towards the United States.

That Mexican sovereignty has become not only a fiction but a baleful fiction is written on the face of the record. Its government is unable to perform those essential functions which entitle it to respect and consideration. It is unable to afford even semi-security to the lives and property of aliens resident in Mexico. It is unable to prevent marauding outlaws from making murderous forays into American territory. If it were not for the European war its egregious failures would have already provoked demands from European governments, injurious to its national integrity. As against the future threat of European intervention it must rely on the United States to protect its supposed independence. It is as incapable of planning and carrying out a healing domestic policy as it is of meeting its foreign obligations. Thus while it is insisting on all the privileges of a sovereign state it is ignoring most of the responsibilities. If it is allowed to continue on this course, the situation in that distracted country is likely to go from bad to worse. Mexico needs outside assistance to an extent which is bound to bring with it outside interference. If President Wilson wishes to make any headway with his Mexican policy he should discard the fiction of Mexican sovereignty, well documented though it be, and should announce without ambiguity that the American army will remain in northern Mexico not only until order is completely restored, but until the continuation of good order is guaranteed by an authoritative and dependable Mexican government.

From the point of view of the administration, there is one serious objection to such a policy. It may well bring about a collision between the American and the Mexican armies; and the President has been anxious to avoid bloodshed and coercion. He is, of course, justified in wishing to avoid bloodshed and coercion and in sacrificing a great deal in order to do so, but what he cannot sacrifice are the objects for which he has been interfering in Mexican affairs. Mexico is a distracted country, in which bloodshed and coercion are the most effective arguments used in domestic controversy. If interference in Mexican affairs is justified in part by the long frontier between the two countries, in part by the necessarily close economic relations between the two countries, in part by the express obligation assumed by the United States to protect Mexico from European intervention, and in part by the undoubted ability of the American government to help the Mexicans in the work of recuperation, as in our opinion it has been and is, it may be necessary to use the familiar Mexican arguments of bloodshed and coercion, in order to make the interference effective. And unless it is effective how can it be beneficial? Hitherto the interference has not been beneficial precisely because it has not been effective. The President could not avoid interfering, and yet when it came to the point, he shrank from supporting his policy with the kind of arguments which the Mexicans in their present state of mind are ready to understand. He was so anxious to avoid the killing of Mexicans by Americans that he would take no sufficient steps to prevent the killing of Americans by Mexicans. He has been so much opposed to the use of force in Mexico for the benefit of American interests that he was afraid to use it for the benefit of Mexican interests. He has been obliged to use force in Mexico, but he has always done so with a bad conscience. He has never properly appraised his own policy as one which might fail unless he was prepared to enforce it at the proper time and in the proper way.

The President's attempt to preserve the fiction of Mexican sovereignty has been to some extent the by-product of Pan-Americanism. The South American statesmen are the great exponents of a rigid legalistic nationalism, which they have been seeking to impose on the country as the essential principle of Pan-American internationalism. According to this principle all states are equally independent and deserve to be kept equally inviolate, no matter how well or ill they used their independence, and no matter how capable or incapable they were of defending it. Although Mexico was torn by internal dissensions, although her recuperation was scarcely possible as long as her government failed to inspire confidence abroad, although she was as a matter of fact helpless against internal and external enemies, she must still be treated as though her sovereign integrity was flawless and perfect. In so treating her the American government was supposed to be acting according to particularly idealistic standards, which would establish new and precious international precedents.

But if the political experience of the past two years has taught anything it has taught the danger and futility of any such theories of absolute national sovereignty. The South American diplomats have been advocating it as a means of giving small and weak states a secure legal protection against aggressive attack; but it provides no such security either in theory or in fact. International security must be provided by an organization of international force, and the only theory on which such a force can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be organized is that of a qualified national sovereignty for both large states and small. If small and weak nations are to be immune from all interference, even though they repudiate their obligations to other nations, large and powerful nations can also claim immunity from interference even though in the exercise of their sovereign discretion they override the rights and interests of their smaller neighbors. A community of absolute sovereigns is a contradiction in terms. So far as they believe themselves to exist, there would be warfare among them, not international government and coöperation. If the smaller nations want the benefit of security, purchased at the expense of their more powerful associates, they must be willing to submit to certain essential minimum standards of good behavior. It is standards of this kind which Mexico has fallen far below. The United States, as the neighbor-protector and the honest friend of Mexico, is justified, in the absence of any recognized source of international authority, to interfere in Mexican internal affairs sufficiently to restore to that country some measure of actual domestic independence and of recognition and confidence from other nations.

Mexican sovereignty is not a sacred legal abstraction; it is a living political instrument which must be justified by its fruits. At present it is working badly because it has not the military, economic or moral resources with which to meet its necessary obligations. Because it is working badly it does not deserve to be suppressed; but it has forfeited its right of complete immunity. If it is to do its work better it must have some assistance, and this assistance must be rendered with Mexican consent if possible, but if not, in spite of Mexican opposition. One of the tasks which the Mexican government is unable to accomplish is that of restoring order in the northern states. An American army has occupied territory in these Mexican border states in order to protect American citizens from murderous assault. There they should remain. The northern states are easier to police from the United States than from southern Mexico. The American government should assume this work, and should not withdraw the American troops until the country is pacified and until a similarly efficient Mexican police force can be substituted for them. Now that the troops are in Mexico they should be used partly for police work in that country and partly to bring pressure upon the Mexican government to accept American advice and assistance. Without such advice and assistance Mexico must remain for an indefinite period helpless and distracted, no matter how proudly Carranza flourishes the legal emblem of Mexican sovereignty, and no matter how much South American diplomats would like to have it reverently saluted.

The Close of the Brandeis Case

THE Brandeis case is closed. The country has been spared humiliation, and the authority of the Court has been immeasurably strengthened. Mr. Brandeis brings with him not only his native gifts, but the renewed confidence of liberal people and humble people throughout the United States. The issue which his nomination represented was one that reached to the depth of American life. It touched the sources of power. It uncovered an aggressive class feeling as threatening to American unity as the attempts of hyphenated politicians. It showed great numbers of well intentioned and respectable men retailing gossip and malicious rumor and losing in the end all sense of fair play and the essentials of decent controversy.

Almost everyone will want to forget all this and let bygones be bygones. For the moment it is better not to forget it, but to look at the situation squarely. Now that liberalism has won the day there are a few things to be said which could not be said while the fight was on. It would have looked as if the supporters of Mr. Brandeis were afraid to meet the attack. They have met it successfully and thwarted it with quiet dignity, and no one can say they have done a thing which the most scrupulous respecter of the Court's tradition can impugn. They have fought in an irritating battle with perfect self-control.

Had Mr. Brandeis's supporters wanted to use the case in all its possibilities they could have developed an agitation of almost unparalleled bitterness. They needed only to pursue the methods of the opposition. If in fighting an appointment of this sort the rich and the powerful hire attorneys, influence newspapers, organize a nation-wide propaganda, and employ elusive slander and insinuation, the counter to it is a blaze of publicity. That means that the Supreme Court is to be in politics with a vengeance. It means that a most dangerous precedent has been established, and that the next time a contested appointment is made we may expect press agents, campaign funds, mass meetings, oratory and political jobbery.

Mr. Brandeis's enemies have done more to drag the Supreme Court into politics than the most extreme radical. They have shown themselves completely obtuse to that restraint with which the American people have always wished to surround their highest tribunal. For the first time to our knowledge an appointment to the Supreme Court has been dealt with through the ordinary methods of agitation. The precedent has been created by the very men to whom the Court is alleged to be sacrosanct, by the very men who are popularly supposed to be the sources of dignity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The harm done cannot well be undone. There is no use shirking the facts. The Court has been dragged into politics, and if at some future time an appointment is made which is as conspicuously conservative as that of Mr. Brandeis was conspicuously liberal, it will not be surprising if the liberals, throwing off the self-restraint they have shown this time, should follow the wretched example set by Mr. Brandeis's conservative enemies.

Philippine Independence

THE Philippines are not to be granted independence at once, nor is a date for their independence to be definitely determined. Such is the decision of Congress and the American people. And we shall probably go on talking in our old way about setting the Philippines free when they are fit for freedom. It is an offensive formula. It derives from Kipling's hypothesis of the oriental peoples as "half devil and half child." So long as we parrot this formula, the whole intellectual class in the Philippines will be forced into an attitude of hostility towards us, yet it is through this class that we must work if we are to foster the spirit of nationalism without which independence would be nothing more than an interlude between foreign aggressions.

But the formula is not merely arrogant, offensive. It is misleading, hypocritical. No matter how well fitted for self-government the Filipinos may be today, it would be a disgraceful repudiation of international obligations to cast them off. They do not relish the dominion of the United States. Well, would they rather become possessions of some other great Power? An idle question; even the Filipinos who like us least would be revolted by our baseness if we should transfer them to another Power. Yet that is what the grant of immediate independence would amount to. The Philippines are rich in natural resources, afflicted with wild tribes, capable of committing acts creating international complications, and as yet without means of self-defense. And the taste for colonial expansion is still alive among nations. Say that we abandon the Philippines. Who would seize them? Japan, of course.

True, the Japanese spokesmen in this country say that Japan does not want the Philippines, and there is no doubting the sincerity of the assertion. Japan has use for all her energies nearer home. The Philippines in our possession are no menace to her security. We could not possibly use them as a base for operations against Japan. Indeed, they represent more than anything else a pledge of our good behavior. But suppose that we set them up as an independent state. Japan is keenly alive to the fact that when the present war is over—and it can't last forever—Germany will hover around the East like an eagle whose nest has been robbed. Japan cannot afford to let Germany have the Philippines, nor would she be strengthened if one of her present allies, England or France or Italy, became established there. With the Philippines independent and unable to defend themselves, Japan would have to take them whether she wanted them or not, just as we should have to extend our control over the Danish West Indies if Denmark set them free. We don't want them, but this fact is entirely irrelevant.

In the light of these considerations, what date shall we set for our definite withdrawal from the Philippines? When they have become sufficiently populous and wealthy to maintain an adequate defensive organization, or when the world has become wearied of imperialistic yearnings, we shall be able to withdraw with honor. A prophet alone could tell us when the time will be ripe. In the meantime it would be more seemly to talk less about Philippine independence and work more to create the conditions in which the grant of independence will be more than a vain and hypocritical gesture.

It is the international situation alone that justifies and demands our retention of the Philippines. We owe it to the Filipinos and to ourselves to keep a strict guard against the designs of foreign exploiters with flags tucked away under their coats. We owe it to the world to see that life and property are secure in the Philippines. It is part of our duty to see that no foreign nation has just ground for complaint of commercial discriminations even in our favor. These are the principal occasions of imperialistic intervention. So far as matters of a purely domestic character are concerned, on the other hand, we have, by right, nothing to say. The Philippines for the Filipinos. If they take kindly to Chinese immigration, let us not press on them our own exclusion laws. If they keep alive social customs displeasing to us, let us limit ourselves to deploring the fact. Time, and the development that is fostered by peace and toleration, will make of Philippine culture a contribution to the world's stock of values all the more important because it does not start with just the same premises as ours.

We ought to keep resolutely in our own hands control over the international relations of the Philippines, and such domestic powers—and no more—as are essential to the fulfillment of our international obligations. The Filipinos are a sensitive and spirited people, but the most sensitive and spirited of them could not take umbrage over our retention of powers they are not yet able to wield, not because they are politically incompetent or inexperienced, but because they are unarmed in a world of bullies. There is no dishonor in the status of a small nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doubtful Voters

ALMOST five months from to-day, for several hours of the day, men in every state of the union, and men and women in a few states, will be marking their ballots and dropping them into the boxes. Many motives will carry these voters to the polling booths—an old habit of voting the Republican or the Democratic ticket, patriotism, Americanism, a hope of being appointed postmaster if the election results in a triumph for the right. At the moment of ballot-marking every one of these motives will almost disappear from the consciousness of the voters, who will one and all be preoccupied by anxiety to mark their ballots correctly. This will be true of voters who would vote for a yellow dog if the right tag were tied round his neck, of those who made up their minds immediately after the conventions, of those who did not make up their minds until the last weeks of the campaign.

It is these doubtful voters who are in theory the game every writing and public-speaking campaigner is hunting. To this theory we Americans sacrifice, every four years, a great deal of our time for four or five months. Campaigns are long because it is the person who desires information, the person who wishes to hear and to examine arguments, the independent voter, the doubtful voter, who decides campaigns. In theory these doubtful voters are divided into the more and the less intelligent, and in practice it is the less intelligent, the voters who can be influenced most readily by suggestion and the force of example, by the force of iteration and the force of noise, at whom nearly all the campaigning is aimed. A campaign is a series of attempts, made almost exclusively by speakers and writers who never admit the reasonableness of hesitation or doubt, to remove doubt and bring hesitation to an end. A campaign is mostly an appeal to open minds by minds that have always been closed.

It is because the less intelligent doubtful voters are supposed to be so numerous and so stupid that the more intelligent doubtful voter gets so little public attention. His open mind is most likely to be influenced by minds which acknowledge that they too were once open, and which are willing to take him over the route they have marched from doubt to certainty, from hesitation to definite choice. Such a process involves the making of admissions, and even the campaigners who realize that the intelligent doubtful voter exists know from experience that any admission they may make with him in mind will be seized by the enemy and drummed into the ears of the stupid doubtful voter.

When the campaign of 1912 began the number of intelligent doubtful voters was unusually large. It is unusually large to-day—larger, with the possible exception of 1912, than it has been for many presidential years. Such doubtful voters are keenly aware that a word like "Americanism" is used both by men who wish their country to achieve national self-consciousness, who wish this self-conscious nationalism to express itself in steady progress toward national and international goals rationally chosen, and also by men who wish the United States to drift in blind isolation. To such doubtful voters a catchword means nothing until its spirit is expressed in a program, and they are getting ready to scrutinize the rival programs, to ask for more light, for specifications, for details. They are convinced that "preparedness" is meaningless in the mouth of a public man who is not willing to discuss the probabilities against which he would have the United States prepare. Not for many years have they been so sick of generalities. They are looking for a leader who knows and is not afraid to say what attitude he would have the United States take toward other nations, whose preparedness program, instead of being an end in itself, is only a means to ends clearly seen and boldly declared.

In the campaign now beginning THE NEW REPUBLIC will try to bring these intelligent doubtful voters to its own decision, to help them in the work of persuading the candidates to be more outspoken and more concrete than candidates usually are. The best way of reaching minds which like frankness is to be frank. The audience we shall talk to is composed of men and women who share in our belief that the choice between two very human candidates for the Presidency, neither of them infallible, may be as momentous as the choice between black and white, between the brave man and the coward; and that the individual doubter's vote counts just as much as that of the man whose enthusiasm keeps him chronically red in the face.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL
WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor and the Call to Arms

WHAT are the workers thinking about the agitation for a stronger military organization of the United States? That is the fundamental question which, like it or not, the men who are writing and talking about our influence in the world have to consider. Without the support of labor, without the enthusiastic allegiance of men who feel that they are accorded justice and a fair share in the opportunities of the national life, all flag-wavings and Fourth-of-July oratory are vanity and rhetoric. This question includes the farmers, for it is significant that on this decisive issue their organizations are acting in sympathy with the organizations of industrial labor, after many years of misunderstanding and distrust. What they think is a prophecy of the future of preparedness.

Among the few utterances that have come from working men there is evidence to arouse strong doubts in the minds of even the most convinced advocates of Americanism concerning the adequacy of their program. There is an open expression of no confidence in the intentions of the influential diplomatists of private life, the financial ambassadors plenipotentiary, little contentment with the degree of welfare which has been achieved by the masses of the people, little loyalty to the policies to which the country is committed at present and over which there is fear of conflict. Yet, curiously enough, small attention seems to have been paid to these indictments of the forces in control of national affairs.

The extremes to which the new patriotism of preparedness has sometimes been carried, in a not unnatural excitement over the sudden chaos which replaced Europe in 1914, are not so surprising as this apparent indifference to the reaction of labor and the causes underlying it. Military relief organizations have refused aid in creating markets for the products of soldiers in prison camps abroad, because of the task of planning base hospitals for a hypothetical invasion. We have listened to our newly militant sisters debating, in serious defense society conference, whether they should drill in trousers, to accustom themselves to something like masculine nimbleness for the enterprise of exterminating invaders whenever they come. Yet few people have taken the trouble to consider a factor essential in any theory of national security based upon organized force and armament—the opinions, false or true, of the people whose work and strength are the vital national resources.

The desires of labor have been made quite clear; and they have received so little discussion that few people are even familiar with them. Yet Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, has stated them explicitly. In a letter to the National Security League, convening at Washington, he called for an army plan in which the interests of the workers should be represented by their leaders on all boards of control and in all determination of policies, for the abolition of any caste system of officering and for equality of opportunity in advancement in rank, for vocational education in connection with military training, and for prohibition of the use of the militia in strike duty. He made the same demands before the National Civic Federation in annual convention in Washington. Later he made the following statement in a pronunciamento to labor:

> The wage earners no longer will be denied their right to participate in determining those things which affect their welfare. . . . No true plan of preparedness can fail to include service for them; therefore they demand that the plan shall be democratized. No part of our citizenship is more unalterably opposed to ideals of militarism and compulsion. . . . If provisions for national preparedness are to be constructive, they must escape the perils of militarism and autocracy; they must be based upon voluntary and democratic principles. . . . Therefore, spokesmen for labor ought to be on every commission, committee, or representative body that is intrusted with consideration of problems and determination of policies.

The response from leaders of the preparedness movement has been a good deal of talk about compulsory military service, the discussion of proposals for forming an industrial reserve in which mechanics would be enlisted subject to military authority for war service, and a calm silence regarding labor's demands for representation on defense boards and for prohibition of strike duty for the militia. Also, it may have been noticed, an equally cold indifference has been developed in many labor circles to the movement for mobilization of American war strength. John J. White, at the head of the United Mine Workers, has only recently reiterated the strong opposition of that body to the agitation for preparedness, and labor's uncertainty about the purposes behind the movement.

A talk with an eastern state labor leader recently revealed how widespread is suspicion of the campaign for increasing military organization. He had been conducting an unofficial poll of the state and local labor unions throughout the country, which registered practically unanimous opposition to any great enlargement of the standing army, any extension of volunteer forces on lines not reformed to create democracy, and to any considerable increase in army or navy expenditures. He predicted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no popularity in the ranks of labor for any leader or party declaring for a radical military program unmodified to give labor consideration and to prohibit strike service. Finally, he claimed to be speaking for large bodies of workers in voicing the suspicion that the preparedness propaganda is using the appeal of patriotism to further the creation of an armed force within the nation which can be used against labor interests to guard the privileges of wealth.

Whatever is thought concerning the validity of such suspicions, they must be taken into account as a set of important facts in the national situation. They are certainly not quieted by an attempt, financed by private subscription, to create a private armed force in one of the largest cities. Even the universal justification for all departures from American institutions, preparedness for defense, does not satisfactorily explain to men who fear a menace for labor in the establishment of forces of mercenaries within the national borders. When there comes the further news of a nation-wide combination of all associations of employers to oppose movements regarded as detrimental to their interests, the condition is still more complicated. Suspicion is not the foundation for national loyalty.

If anything can be judged from past relations between labor organizations and the National Guard, little support for the militia can be expected from labor under the plans for military reorganization now proposed. The plan for a fully federalized volunteer force, had it been democratically developed, might have been more popular, despite fears of centralized power. The National Guard will remain the same organization whose strike service has aroused the antagonism of workers from Colorado to West Virginia and Massachusetts. It will remain the organization that used its influence in the New York State Constitutional Convention to defeat the affirmation of the common-law principle that citizens shall not be tried by a military tribunal so long as the civil courts are open. The contention that the clause would hamper the action of the National Guard in times of civil disorder was not calculated to reassure labor as to the way in which the authority of the state troops would be exercised in industrial disputes. It is doubtful whether pay for the militia and strengthening the political power for patronage of an organization which already had votes, guns, and courts-martial, will win workers to a force which has so often been employed against them. The officers of the National Guard Association, who argued for the militia pay bill in the hearings before the Senate and House Miltary Affairs Committees, also contended strongly against curtailment of the action of their forces in strikes.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has protested against the failure to invite representatives of the workers to take part in conferences concerning Pan-American relations and interests. It has taken the initiative in creating connections with the labor organizations of Mexico, to aid in establishing order. Its voice has been for peace, because in common with the farmers it now realizes that the interest of both is not in national antagonisms, but in international organization and coöperaton. It proposes to make labor's influence felt in the settlement of the new world conditions after the war, through a labor congress coincident with the peace conference.

The workers would take their part in a really defensive war; but before they can be won for any military program they will have to be convinced that it embodies the spirit of democracy and is to be developed only in the interests of the people as a whole. They do not propose to be used to force collection of inflated war debts from a bankrupt Europe, as many of them actually express the belief that they might. The strikes which they are now carrying on for higher wages in many parts of the country indicate their opinion of the theory that trade advantages and profits automatically mean prosperity for all. They are outspoken in their declaration that they have no interest in a Monroe Doctrine or an Open Door policy which would mean merely a demand for special commercial privileges in foreign fields, to be backed if necessary by armed force enlisted from workers who feel that they often cannot secure their share of profit from present markets.

England, in the present war, found some of her most serious dangers at home, in the disaffection of numbers of her own citizens who felt that their country had given them nothing worth the risk of life. England had to pay the price of a national negligence which had allowed her people to suffer exploitation and degradation. It proved to be no use to shout about patriotism to men whose families often had to go hungry and whose wives and daughters were often forced to work in factories. Which were the dangerous and disloyal Englishmen—those who were reluctant to give up hard-won union conditions on the ground that they had never had anything to be patriotic about, or those who were responsible for the injustices underlying the lack of patriotism?

In the antagonism of factions in America, evident in the present campaign for military preparedness, there is indication that America faces a similar situation. Our political leaders and men of affairs have received the double challenge of England's experience and of the distrust of their own workers. The labor-union men can hardly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be confused with non-resistants. No plan of preparedness can enlist their support which does not first disarm their suspicions with a sincere program based on consideration of social and industrial demands. Without such a program some national crisis of the future, either of peace or war, may find America facing disunion and hostility within its own gates.

MALCOLM W. DAVIS.

Whitman's Idea of the State

THE American democracy that Whitman extolled was quite incidentally connected with any form of government. He regarded lawmakers, judges and executives as a salaried clerical staff, toward the more elevated of whom he was inclined to feel the same resentment that he showed toward the successful employer. Business to him was an activity whose reward was in the useful employment it offered. The gain was incidental except when it was unduly great, and then it became contemptible. In like manner government was a public utility rather than a ruling power, and the ideal man in office was like Dr. Johnson's lexicographer, a harmless drudge.

His allusions to the chief magistrate were quite uncalculated but quite consistent. For the "Presidentiad" he had a liking. It was a neat modern label for a four year term, and by implication displaced the Olympiad as a thing of the past. For the idea of the Presidency, or even for any master of the White House except the man Lincoln, he had little respect. In one of his catalogue passages he placed the President casually between a felon and a judge, and in another between a draggled prostitute and "three matrons stately and friendly." Any mechanic might rise to the high level, it was a trifle to do so; but Whitman would rather be a good friend than any kind of President, who was much less needed than a poet, was an "agent for pay," usually a trafficker in "dangled mirages," and pale-faced at the thought of public opinion.

For public opinion Whitman's respect was great, but not as a positive daily agency for good political ends. He respected it less as a dynamo than as dynamite, and even at that less as a useful explosive than as a source of terror. He explained that the great city was

> Where the populace rise at once against the never-ending audacity of elected persons,

and declared that he would

> make a song for the ears of the President full of weapons with menacing points.

It was a certain and final fiat to be recorded against "the frivolous judge," "the corrupt Congressman, Governor, Mayor," and "the mumbling and screaming priest" on the popular day of judgment. Until that day abuses might continue without any reforming check from the poet, who would observe in silence "all the meanness and agony without end."

This estimate of public opinion as a kind of millennial voice ran counter to any assumption of immediate responsibility toward the state. If Whitman was at all interested in either the rights or the duties of the voter, he kept his sentiments to himself. Naturally if the holders of office were a negligible crew, the process of choosing them was a matter of no importance; and if social evolution was in due time certain to bring things out by a sort of cataclysmic turn, there was little use in bothering with ephemeral details. Whitman's governmental policy was simply a vehement asseveration of Emerson's: "Be good and You will be happy; and if Everybody is good, Everybody will be happy. (In fact, as I am continually reminding You, when I say You I always mean Everybody, as well as when I say I.)"

The one civic duty he emphasized was the most obvious and primitive—that of the soldier. Yet even at this point his militarism was highly sublimated. He never feared national invasion, he never talked of national honor, he had no thought of conquest for territory, much less for the protection of trade. Justice, then, in behalf of those who could not fight for themselves was the only cause for fighting left in his calendar. The army in the back of his mind was a shining host with plumes of snow, whose warfare was to be a holy crusade. His distrust of creeds and institutions would have made him protest at the assignment of "Onward Christian Soldiers" as its battle hymn, but a Christian soldiery it was, with a mission to wage unselfish war solely in the name of humanity.

This fine abstraction fitted well with the loose federation of states which composed Whitman's America. He liked to dwell on the provincal differences in race, climate, occupation, with their resultant clean-marked differences of character in different parts of the country; and he regularly indicated those provincial differences by mention of states rather than sections of this "Far breathed land! Arctic braced! Mexican breezed! the diverse! the compact." In the exalted conviction that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts in the social as well as in the mathematical world, he declared:

> I will make a song for these States, that no one State may under any circumstances be subjected to another State
> And I will make a song that there shall be comity by day and by night between all The Stars and between any two of them.

The America that Walt Whitman loved was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearly a community rather than a government. His new democracy was a composite of personalities, in each of whom he was interested very much on his own account, but even more because taken together they all were the stuff from which nations are made. Thus he held to the conventional view of children and immigrants as potential Americans, and also to the less commonplace one that all are necessary to the whole, and none are irredeemable. "The only government is that which makes kinute of individuals."

At this point Whitman resembled Carlyle more than Emerson in his insistence upon activity. Health of soul or body, he said, depends on exercise. Whitman did not rise to Ruskin's belief in spiritual growth through excellence of craftsmanship. He held for muscular and spiritual exertion because exertion is admirable in itself. In a primitive way he therefore distrusted the sedentary intellectual man though he believed in the poet and the "philosoph," and he applauded the open-air laborer who worked and sweated visibly, because the man of brawn was developing himself by doing the work of the "divine average" at the same time that he was accepting the challenge of nature by wresting the world's food from the soil, or by digging and delving to make Mother Earth a better place to live upon. The farther labor was removed from the soil the less he cared for it; hunter, fisher, mariner, miner, farmer, then the mechanic, then the clerk, then the priest and the university professor. Yet his fear of the nicer refinement was not a mere churlish dislike for people different from himself. It was born of the fear of decadence, the fear of "elegance, civilization, delicatesse." The vandal did not attract him because of his vandalism, but because of his restless vandalian strength. He would rather trust the future to Attila than to Nero.

This brings us to the heart of his whole social philosophy. The state was a spiritual entity containing the soul of the future. America was the promised land, the cradle of universal liberty, and that not because of any positive virtue aside from its youth and its innocence. As he looked upon it he stood as in the presence of a young Olympian.

> America, curious toward foreign characters, stands by its own at all hazards,
> Stands removed, composite, sound—initiates the true use of precedents,
> Does not repel them, or the past, or what they have produced under their forms,
> Takes the lesson with calmness.

At first glance it seems a far cry from the unruled spontaneous land of love, and democracy, and religion, and freedom, and peace, and meanness and agony without end, to America "the promise and reliance of the future." It would seem a rather dim prospect toward any good end to resolve the entire population into an amiable committee of the whole without any chairman. But even though Whitman was an agitator rather than an organizer, the organizing force was the biggest single factor in his philosophy. For he believed in the manifest destiny with a passionate faith. And he relied on it in the way of the pacific philosopher. The future of America was assured because the race was safe, and the future of the race was safe because God willed it so. On this theme Whitman sang with epic fervor of the determinant which is at the back of all faith, the

> Unseen moral essence of all the vast materials of America, (age upon age, working in Death the same as in Life)
> [The powers] that, sometimes known, oftener unknown, really shape and mould the New World.

This large-hearted desire for race and national evolution is not in any way to be confounded with the protestations of any of the warring powers today. There was nothing of what is usually regarded as national aspiration in it. There is as much difference between Whitman's belief in the future of America and the imperial dreams for which England and Germany are now fighting, as there was between the personal ambitions of himself and Jay Gould. Whitman wrought for the spiritual development of America, while Jay Gould built the railroads. Whitman extolled labor, while Jay Gould employed it. Whitman loafed and invited his soul, while Jay Gould made money. But Jay Gould's vast projects extended only to the Pacific, and Whitman's dream reached "beyond the sunset and the baths of all the western stars."

The opening retort courteous to such a commentary is perfectly obvious. It is the *argumentum ad hominem* that Jay Gould was more useful to the country than Whitman was—that a country full of Whitmans would have brought us by now into a delirium of chaotic helplessness. And the counter reply is equally obvious, that by this time a country full of Jay Goulds would have become a self-exterminated harvest of dragon's teeth. There is little profit in personalities of this sort. Any live country can make places and find uses for men of supreme eccentricity, men who are at the far poles both from each other and from the equatorial average. The one ray of light that comes out of such recriminative talk reveals the fact, however, that these two were finely antithetic American types: the complete captain of industry who in the name of progress crushes competitors to the glory of God, and the abstract philanthropist who in the name of brotherhood damns competition by the same formula. Whitman tried to disarm criticism by anticipating it. "I myself but write one or two indicative words for the future." "I charge you forever reject those who would expound me, for I cannot expound my-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self." This is a well tried and ingratiating approach to the public, but at best a gratuitous admission of weakness. If Jay Gould was a harbinger of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller without their expiatory benevolence, Walt Whitman was a forerunner of several million less prosperous Americans whose vociferative loyalty is minus program, and expressive of nothing but unfocused optimism.

There is another criticism to which the poet exposes himself. He was by nature and experience even more devoid of any international sense than the average man of his day. His mind seemed to entertain no concepts between his tangibly concrete surroundings and the most distantly vague abstractions. There was no one in his social vista between Peter Doyle on a street car platform and the "presence . . . whose dwelling is the light of setting suns." What he knew of America he knew down to the ground; but of the rest he was grossly ignorant; and of Europe he had no clear imagination. It was a philosophical encyclopedia, a thesaurus of abstractions, but not a place where people lived. Much less was it a congeries of nations which were for definite and human and credible reasons fighting their way through the nineteenth century to the grim climax of to-day. His view of the world was like a landscape without any middle distance. Here was America in which the problems of the future were to be solved while Europe stood yonder in admiring expectancy. There was no Orient—nothing beyond Poland and the Balkans. In the fullness of time all the other nations would follow after this people who had shown nothing but contempt for the Old World, and a desire to be kept uncontaminated by it.

So his idea of the state is baffling at some points, and irritating at others. It is fragmentary and inarticulate, and in these respects representatively American. But, after all is said and done, it is hope-inspiring, and in its individualistic philosophy essentially sound. Program-makers are cropping up on every side now; their work is not his. If he were living to-day he would still be singing indomitably of the future,

> Have the elder races halted?
> Do they drop and end their lesson, wearied, over there beyond the seas?
> We take up the task eternal, and the burden and the lesson,
> Pioneers, O pioneers.

PERCY H. BOYNTON.

Germany and the Monroe Doctrine

LONG before the outbreak of the war the peaceful, natural growth of the German people was looked upon by some writers as a possible cause of a great international conflagration. Germany, they explained, is unable to maintain her growing population at home; she is unwilling to lose her people by emigration; she has been trying to direct them to her newly acquired African colonies, but she has failed, for in all her possessions there were but a few thousand white settlers. She will look around, they continued, for other parts of the world, which are fit for the settlement of a white race. There are but two groups of countries which have a temperate climate, and which are not yet thickly populated: the British dominions in Australia and Canada, and the Latin-American countries of South America. To attempt the control of the British dominions would mean a war with the British Empire; a settlement in South America would mean an infringement of the Monroe Doctrine, and probably a conflict with the United States.

In the days before the war these theories were not yet worked out in fascinating detective stories like Mr. Phillips Oppenheim's "Mr. Grex of Monte Carlo"—with the possible exception perhaps of Mr. Roland Usher's "Pan-Germanism." But even then quotations from German authors, which seemed to indicate Germany's supposed intentions on South America, were eagerly exploited. That was easily done. Most German text-books on international law would contain a statement that the Monroe Doctrine was not an international treaty, but merely a policy laid down by the United States in its own interest. Was that not a proof, it was said, of Germany's secret plans? And was not the real meaning of such statements made quite clear when Germany insisted that her citizens must have the full enjoyment of rights guaranteed to them in any South American country with which she was at peace? Was not the blockade of Venezuela, proposed by England and joined by Germany and Italy, overwhelming evidence of Germany's desire to grab land? There is no doubt that the legal aspect of the Monroe Doctrine had a great fascination for the German students of international law. In denying its legal character, their conclusions were pretty much the same as those of most level-headed Americans. But the real question was not of law, but of policy. Neither Germany nor the sovereign states of South America, nor anybody else had given up any rights on account of the Monroe Doctrine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The German mind is not a "formalistic" mind. German foreign policy is not based on lawyers' opinions, if they are not supported by very substantial material facts. Now there are no substantial facts in existence which could induce the German government to make an attempt on the Monroe Doctrine. While the talk about getting land for emigration went on merrily, German emigration had come to a standstill, notwithstanding a growth of population from forty millions to sixty-eight millions. A regular influx of immigration into Germany had set in, bringing annually three-quarters of a million of seasonal laborers from Austria and Russia. There was no immigration problem left and there would be none in the future, as long as German trade and industry gave employment to the people at home, and as long as foreign countries provided Germany with raw materials and markets for her industries.

It is quite true there were some dangers ahead in that respect. Whenever some independent country was merged into somebody's colonial empire, her market was lost to free competition from Germany —as was the case in Manchuria and in Morocco. But in South America things were different. The Monroe Doctrine had prevented the partition of South America into spheres of interest at a time when Germany had not yet gone in for overseas aspirations. Its maintenance in the future will insure the system of the open door, under which Germany's trade with South America has flourished. For that trade is not based on monopolies and concessions. The railroads in South America, with very few exceptions, are in the hands of the English and the French; so are the mines and most land companies, and many of the banks. The majority of South American government stocks have been floated in France and in England. Apart perhaps from electrical plants, German business with South America is distinctly competitive. It is based mainly on the adaptability of the much abused "rigid German mind," which in that part of the globe seems flexible enough, and which the world is quite at liberty to imitate.

The Monroe Doctrine saved Germany from the necessity of choosing in South America between the loss of a market and the participation in some scheme of partition, a choice she had to make in China and later on in Morocco. From her point of view this was very fortunate.

If South America had been an uninhabited continent the case might have been different. It would have been easy then to gain a foothold and to start a settlement, which would have developed into a daughter state. No severe strain on her military or financial resources would have followed. British colonization in Australia has shown that plainly.

A somewhat similar result could be achieved if South America had been inhabited exclusively by undeveloped native races. Here again neither conquest nor occupation would be difficult. Experience in Africa has proved that the total military force with which Germany ruled about thirteen million natives scattered over a million square miles in Africa was but three thousand white men. But South America is not an uninhabited country; it cannot be settled by German immigration, not even if immigrants in sufficient numbers were available. The mass of her people are of Latin stock, and even the majority of her immigrants are non-German. Of four and one-half million immigrants pouring into the Argentine Republic, only sixty thousand were Germans—against two and one-quarter million Italians. Of the total number of immigrants to Brazil, but 3.4 per cent were Germans. South America was a Latin-Indian country; it is becoming more Latin every day. Even if there were no native-born South Americans, it would remain Latin, for the German immigrants could never come in great numbers, as they cannot compete with the standards of living of the Portuguese, Spaniards or Italians. South America could never be peacefully colonized by Germany, as Australia was by England; she would have to be conquered.

An island country like England, which is not subject to foreign invasion and is free to send an expeditionary force of professional soldiers wherever she wants to get a foothold, might indulge in such an adventure. Germany needs her army at home. She will always be surrounded by powerful nations, for even a complete victory will not reduce Russia, France, Italy and England to mere figureheads. It would be madness for a country thus situated to try to conquer a far-off continent. For a continent it would be assuredly. All the states of South America must be the enemies of the new colony from its birthday. A policy of being kept permanently in a state of siege by hostile neighbors would be the only alternative to an aggressive forward policy across a whole continent. And the only advantage which might be secured would be the settlement, in some selected spots, of small groups of German "Loyalists." The burden of such an experiment has been shown on a small scale by England's experiences in South Africa. It took her three years to defeat the two small Boer Republics with about 300,000 white inhabitants, women and children included. She wanted about 300,000 soldiers to do it, and she spent over one billion dollars. And England had two friendly colonies, Cape Colony and Natal, which she used as bases; she had the control of the sea and did not need an army at home. Germany would have no bases to start from—even if she had the goodwill of the United States. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintenance of an army of occupation five thousand miles across the sea would be an awful strain on her resources. She could not hold the country without such an army, for she could never hope to Germanize the natives. Here, too, she can learn from England. Ireland is but a small island two and three-quarters hours away from England; she has been settled three times on a big scale by English colonists; she has always remained a source of weakness to her conqueror. And while South Africa seems to show just now how easy pacification is today, she really will in due time teach another lesson: the South-African Boer has fought the Germans not because he has become a British patriot, but because he had to get rid of the German neighbor first, before he could safely think of a South African Republic. Germany would fare worse in South America than England has ever done in Ireland. Where she wasted her strength on a small island, Germany would spend hers on a continent.

That huge half continent of South America has long ago passed the stage where the forceful annexation of any of her parts might have seemed easy and therefore profitable. The ever increasing difficulties inherent in an attempt at colonization form a stronger safeguard of South American independence than the most explicit international acknowledgement of the Monroe Doctrine. And a victorious Germany will have her hands too full of more profitable tasks—like African colonization and the economic reorganization of the Near East—to follow a policy of expansion not suitable to her own interests.

M. J. Bonn.

Continuation Schools

THE movement for vocational education has done nothing more valuable than to show us how far we are still from realizing the public school as a child-community, first of all as a quickening life and only secondarily as an educational institution. The rapidly extending " continuation school " is perhaps the most obvious symptom of this failure. The term itself is unfortunate, for it drags along with it the old separation of education from living. It suggests something in the way of a surplus, of extension schooling beyond an allotted time, as if its pupils were getting an educational largess out of some great social bounty. Actually the " continuation school " represents educational deficit; the necessity for it registers our failure to provide an earlier school-community life for children which would have kept them out of industry. Also it registers our failure to provide child-labor laws which would have protected them.

The continuation school is officially a " school for employed minors fourteen to sixteen years of age," and is intended to hold, by the tenuous thread of four to six hours a week school attendance, those boys and girls who have gotten their employment certificates at the earliest legal age and are floundering about in low-paid occupations, mostly unskilled. New York City alone has 58,000 such children, fourteen and fifteen years of age, two-thirds of whom have never completed the elementary school. Stores, offices, shops, domestic service, messenger service absorb these boys and girls, untrained and unfocused, and the truly formidable burden is placed upon them of making their skilful way in the world. Popular tradition tries to make us glow with the belief that this world is a ladder up which virtue and industry will automatically ascend. But unfortunately the ladder of opportunity rarely reaches down so far. The lowest rung is beyond their reach. The gap between it and the ground is often too great even for initiative and character to bridge. The " employed minors fourteen to sixteen years of age " become the nucleus for that partly employed, sodden and anemic mass of drifters which drags down labor everywhere and clogs social progress.

The education which these children have had has in most cases barely fitted them to remain upright on the ground, not to speak of reaching for the ladder. The acquirement of literacy, a more or less uncertain skill in figuring, the exposure to some miscellaneous historical and geographical information—this has been the real substance of their five or six years' schooling. To most of these children it is probable that the world of printed symbols will never mean very much. A real school would have striven to awaken their concrete and constructive intelligence, given play to all the non-intellectual impulses. It is just the tedium and artificiality of the old school which has sentenced them now to stand at the bottom of the occupational scale. Without class-prestige, economic advantages, manners, extraordinary initiative or intelligence, most of these children are handicapped from the start. Literate, they are perhaps fitted to compete on equal terms with each other for work. But for the passing into better-paid, more interesting, more responsible and skilful activity, their schooling, though it came at the most plastic and active time of childhood, has done nothing whatever.

We try, therefore, through the " continuation school " to make up bravely to these children what they have lost. We try to lift them so that they can clutch at the lowest rung of the ladder. We find it easier to make stabs at repairing the damage than to reorganize the elementary school so as to prevent it. In Wisconsin cities a boy or girl leaving school at fourteen to go to work is required to attend day

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuation school five hours a week for three years. In Boston the children must attend for four hours a week for two years. In Pennsylvania cities they must attend eight hours a week for two years. Continuation schools for 20,000 children are in process of formation by the New York City Board of Education. Wisconsin's forty-five industrial and continuation schools are compulsory, while in the other states which have permissive laws the schools may be made locally compulsory. Employers are required to dismiss their child employees on working days and within working hours, the school time being reckoned as part of the time that minors are permitted by law to work.

Such laws obviously follow the line of least resistance. They add to the school system without revitalizing it. At the same time, a scheme like the Massachusetts plan suggests that the continuation school may be developed into a real stimulus of incentive. This plan provides for three kinds of classes. For those " employed minors " who are already in semi-skilled work, it provides some training and background for the trade or occupation chosen. There are also trade preparatory classes for pupils who have definitely chosen the trade for which they wish training, but have not yet found placement in the trade. Then there are " pre-vocational " classes for those who are ambitious to make some intelligent choice of an occupation. These pupils are given varied shopwork, visits to shops and factories, and personal consultation with teachers and employers. Classes are small, and intensive work can be done. The other pupils, employed in unskilled labor and without definite vocational leanings, go into " general improvement courses," where half the time is spent in regular school subjects continuing the elementary school work; a quarter of the time is devoted to " the discovery and development of dominant interests and powers," and the rest of the time to what is quaintly called " civics, hygiene, recreation and culture." In this latter activity one-quarter of the time of the " pre-vocational " and trade courses is similarly spent. Pupils may transfer from one class to another when they are ready. If the purpose of the continuation school is to bridge that gap between the ground and the level where opportunity can at all begin to mean anything, this Massachusetts plan would seem to do it in an easily graduated and flexible way. The untrained and unfocused worker has at least a chance to have his imagination stimulated and to learn the rudiments of some better work.

The sanguine advocates of the continuation school, however, are apt to assume that this chance is equivalent to an effective vocational training. They forget that of the 10,000 or more children whom Wisconsin provides with compulsory continuation schooling a majority must necessarily remain in the general improvement classes or else get only a rudimentary training. And five hours a week for education against fifty for routine labor is not likely to make over the boys and girls who are pulled into the school for a brief respite from the department stores, messenger and domestic service, mills and factories, millinery and dressmaking shops. Even in the stimulating Massachusetts atmosphere one hour a week for " civics, hygiene, recreation and culture " seems hardly availing. In the light of the kind of school-community life which every progressive state now knows enough to provide and could afford to provide, the continuation school seems a pathetic if necessary palliative for our educational sins. Already loud complaints are heard against " allowing the public school to pass on its failures for some one else to bury." The first lesson of the continuation school is that it should not be needed. Even employers repeatedly declare that to industry children under sixteen are of no real value as workers. The states are one after another jacking up their child-labor limit to sixteen years. We are rapidly coming to the public conviction that the school should care for all children's activity up to that age. What the continuation school does now for four hours a week, we are insisting that the regular school shall do for thirty or even forty hours a week.

But this means that we shall have to have a reinvigorated school. It must not be a prison where children are kept when they long for the freedom of outside work. It must be a place where full opportunity for expression is provided for each child in a varied life of study and work and play. It must be an organic life and not an institution. No system of industrial and continuation schools piled on at the top will effect this. The evening school has largely failed because it demanded an impossible concentration and perseverance from the over-fatigued and excitement-craving worker. The continuation school, dealing with restless and unintegrated children, will be ineffective for the same reason. The vocational movement goes blundering on in amazing disregard of the psychology of the worker. Even the docile German child, it is said, must be coerced into his admirable continuation school where he gets a thorough orientation in his relations to his work, the community and his comrades. What are admirable trades and studies going to mean to boys and girls who are doing the most rudimentary work, their impulses undirected, their minds filled with sex-fantasy, personal mirages, and all the cheap and feeble excitements of the city streets? The groping and desiring spirit of youth is going indomitably to resist your most thoughtful schemes until you have a school which from the earliest years, by its freedom, its expressive life, its broad communal and personal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excitements, its contact with real things, provides a child-life which meets these inner needs. Our best American public schools already begin to show that such a child-community life is not at all impossible. Until we achieve it generally, our continuation school will be one of the stop-gaps, and a lusty warning of what we have failed to achieve.

RANDOLPH BOURNE.

Must We Have Her?

NOW and then in a diplomatic corps may be found a student of national traits. Lord Bryce, we recall, was thus inquisitive about American traits, and among the queries I overheard him make of more than one Washington hostess was, "Why are there no political salons in Washington?" On one occasion he was given, I thought, a fairly satisfactory answer. "Because," said the lady, "we always have to ask their wives."

Not long ago I was engaged to dine in the house of the president of a woman's college. "We are to be a party of six," the president said, and she named the women of the faculty she expected. "No men," she added, "no men of the faculty, for that would necessitate asking the faculty wives." There we have the woman's college classification—faculty men, faculty women, and faculty wives.

Manners in Washington or in college circles are perhaps a bit old-fashioned compared, shall we say, with New York manners. At least there are groups in New York where the unit of measure tends to be the individual, not the couple. And yet even in these comparatively modern circles thinking in terms of the individual appears at times embarrassing. "He won't go without her," is judged quite a sufficient reason for asking some one you'd rather not have at your dinner table. "She'd be hurt if we didn't ask *him*," may be said of a woman to whose feeling under other circumstances you probably pay less attention. The subterfuge of asking a man to fill a place is still taken seriously. Nor is it so much a way of letting a wife save her face in acknowledgment of her right to be invited too, as a recognition of her proprietorship in her husband. I have known women who would even tolerate being asked if they would let their husbands dine out unaccompanied. The formula, "Will you lend him to me?" is not even bad form.

A husband or a wife is a personal taste, a private taste. To force your predilections on others is generally accounted in bad taste. In this case you not only obtrude your matrimonial taste on others, you obtrude it crassly and irresponsibly. You do not even sit next to your husband or wife at the dinner table or talk to him or her in the entr'acte. You may enjoy walking or motoring with him or her to the party and talking it over afterwards; but surely to demand that opportunity of enjoyment of your hostess is asking a little too much. Might you not as well expect her to provide you with the preprandial hot bath necessary to put you in a pleasant mood for dinner or with the comfortable bed in an airy room welcome in due time after dinner? Bath or bed is a private luxury. So is a husband or a wife.

A luxury, if you like, urges the scrupulous, but also a responsibility. Wouldn't it be selfish of you to go "out" alone, to leave your mate at home alone? It might be, it might not be. If you went "out" without her or him, you might not be leaving her or him alone; even so, there are sometimes worse things than being left alone. However, grant the selfishness, grant that your mate is utterly dependent upon you and your circle for company, utterly unable to make a personal circle, grant that without you and your friends she or he is utterly lonely and wretched, grant all this—do you find in it any justification for compelling your hostess and her guests to share your responsibility, to help you not to be selfish?

If you do, you may be asked why you draw the line at the conjugal relation. You may well have scruples in the matter of being a companion to your mother or sister or son. Why not expect your hostess to respect institutionally your filial or fraternal or parental scruples and help you to be a good son, a devoted brother, a self-sacrificing father? "Dine out without my boy? Surely not, he is so lonely at home. Go to a dance without my sister? What would she do for an escort? Lunch with a girl without my mother? That would hurt my mother's feelings; it would never do." Truly is there any reason we should ask our hostess to protect our sense of conjugal solidarity any more than our sense of kinship solidarity?

There are occasions, to be sure, when some of us may indeed be offended if our kindred as well as our spouse are not included in the invitation—to a very large ball or a fashionable wedding, or an all-inclusive garden party perhaps we think they too might have been asked. To have them omitted from "functions" is derogatory, we may reason, to the family prestige. It is the family rather than the couple which is the unit of value in connection with a "function," with the impersonal, social ceremonial. And as long as the form of social intercourse is purely ceremonial this attitude seems fairly justifiable. For in connection with a ceremonial the individual does not count as a personality but as a representative of an institution, of the family, let us say, or of marriage.

But when we ask people to dine with us or to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

join a discussion group or a tennis game or a yachting party are we motivated by a desire to support the sanctity of institutions, of the family or even of marriage? Or do we wish merely to bring people together for fun or interest? For an institutional sanction or propaganda an institutional method of selection is proper enough; but for personal relations only a personal method of selection can succeed. Ceremonial forms of intercourse are becoming archaic, they are passing rapidly, extraordinarily rapidly, out of modern life. Most of us like this change or affect to like it.

So much for our plea for a new, less institutional, more personal form of social intercourse, and for the rights of a hostess and her other guests. What of the rights of the spouse as an individual rather than as a representative of an institution? As an individual, a self-respecting person, as we say, the lady or the gentleman who honors us in marriage would not wish ordinarily to go where she or he is not wanted. To be an unwelcome intruder is surely offensive to a well bred person. Is it fair to force such a person into such a position? Out of respect for our mate and in fairness to her or to him should we not resent the tacitly contemptuous treatment accorded her or him as a tagger-on? (And let us realize that whether she or he is chronically a tagger-on, under our prevailing etiquette there are occasions when any wife or any husband must become a tagger-on.) Should we not wish our acquaintances to extend their invitations to our mate sincerely or to extend them not at all?

A very slight change in polite usage would, if not guarantee, at any rate facilitate, I venture to suggest, this social sincerity. This sending of quite separate invitations, separate I mean in form, not necessarily of course in date, would suggest at least that each recipient was wanted for her own sake or for his. Although in itself a small matter, the separate invitation would contribute, I do indeed believe, somewhat like the separate dressing room or the separate bank account, to the establishment of personal decency and dignity.

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS.

CORRESPONDENCE

Britain's Free Trade Policy

SIR: In his article on "America at the Peace Conference" in your issue of April 22nd Mr. George Louis Beer seems to regard almost as a foregone conclusion the abandonment by Great Britain of her free trade system which, as he says, "constituted the greatest force for peace during the last seventy years." It would, I think, be a pity if his statement passed unchallenged as an estimate based on the existing state of British opinion. I have been in many various parts of the country in recent months, particularly in industrial centers, and I can see no evidence at all that there has been any change in the opinion of the mass of the people as to the adoption of a system of protection. The fact that we are proposing to raise a budget of five hundred millions without resort to protection would seem to be an argument in the other direction.

Possibly Mr. Beer has been influenced by a recent article in your columns by Mr. Brailsford. It is quite true that certain newspapers which Mr. Brailsford dislikes have been writing in the strain that he describes; but I think he forgot, like their editors, that England is not governed by newspapers. The English have an astonishing faculty of polite silence in the face of foolish newspaper campaigns which has often misled the unwary. The question of the adoption of a system of protection is, of course, quite distinct from the question of the political federation of the British Empire and the question of closer economic associations between the Allies. There are other and better means of federation and of alliance and mutual help than customs unions and the imposition of duties. There are also other ways of manifesting the complete breakdown of the confidence of our trading classes in German methods and dealings.

It seemed worth while correcting what is only an individual remark in Mr. Beer's article, because it would be a pity if American readers were led to suppose that the ordinary man in Great Britain had in any way forgotten the cause for which we are fighting. The working man has a far better understanding of the underlying issues of the war than Fleet Street has ever had, and the persistent misrepresentation, in one direction after another, of his attitude and ideals by a section of the British press is one of the minor tragedies of the war.

ALFRED ZIMMERN.

London, England,
May 8th.

"Esteemed Contemporaries"

SIR: "The estimable *Survey,*" according to Edward A. Fitzpatrick, of Madison, Wisconsin, in your issue of May 27th, "the estimable *Survey* writes its report of this meeting evidently from the partial accounts of the newspaper. Surely the writer of the report was not present at the meeting, and the readers of *The Survey* are denied an intelligent report of one of the most significant conferences that has been held in years."

Now it so happens that *The Survey* was represented by a staff member throughout the sessions of the Conference on Community Centers, to which the letter refers. In the space available—1,000 words—it was not possible to give an adequate report of a convention. It was possible, and the attempt was made, to state the leading points made by both sides in the fundamental question of policy and control which was discussed: the Wisconsin contention that the authorities must keep a tight rein on community centers and support them solely from public funds; the New York contention that revokable charters be issued to responsible groups of citizens, who be given a free hand to run the centers, and that in addition to public money these groups be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permitted to raise funds through admission charges for motion pictures, dances and the like.

This was the first time that the Wisconsin group—the pioneers and organizers of community centers—had been challenged by another group whose plan also was backed by experience.

As a member of *The Survey* staff, but not the one who wrote this piece, I submit it as a surviving example of the "lost art of reporting" for which the estimable Fitzpatrick mourns.

ARTHUR P. KELLOGG.

New York City.

In Defense of Reporters

SIR: Mr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick's letter on the subject of reporters, published in a recent issue of THE NEW REPUBLIC, amuses me. It illustrates how we may miss the truth by jumping at conclusions. I say that Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter amuses me and that it misses the truth because I happen to be a reporter myself, acquainted in some degree with facts of which he seems entirely ignorant.

No, Mr. Fitzpatrick, there is no need to ask for "the fact-loving, truth-serving, intelligent reporter." He and his brothers are still with us. But you should, if you love the truth, pray for the fact-loving, truth-serving newspaper owner, without bias, without interests beyond his paper, who fears and favors no class, who has no prejudices and panders to none. When we shall have more of this type of newspaper proprietor, then shall our reporters be free to tell the truth, without coloring or emphasis or distortion.

I tell Mr. Fitzgerald that he will find "the fact-loving, truth-seeking reporter" everywhere, but when that reporter's copy must be doctored up by the rewrite man to make it flashy, when that reporter refuses to invent stories (when he doesn't use his imagination, as the euphemism goes) he is called a poor newspaper man. A city editor once called a friend of mine a "bum reporter." He asked why and the blunt answer was, "Because you can't tell a lie and you haven't enough imagination to cook up a story."

A reporter's success on the average newspaper depends upon how skilfully he can weave ordinary facts into a story that shall be topped by bold-faced headlines. Coloring and exaggeration enter here. His success depends also upon how far he will mentally prostitute himself. It depends upon how well he can lie. To the average newspaper, one good liar is worth ten "fact-loving, truth-seeking" reporters. These newspapers include not only the yellow and the sensational journals, but many of the so-called conservative papers which sometimes, but not so often, lie with as much composure as the yellowest papers in town.

I will explain. At the time of the coal strike in Pennsylvania some years ago, a fellow newspaper man was sent down from this city to get the "facts." He was then employed by one of the conservative sheets. He wrote the truth, but the truth was on the side of the striking laborers. He was given a gentle hint that those facts were not wanted. He persisted in writing the truth. Within a week, he was told that his services were no longer required.

I am not familiar with the inside facts of the publication of the Maurer lie. But I can undertake to explain how such a lie might have been published. The reporter who attended the meeting at which Mr. Maurer spoke knew full well that when he said "To hell with the stars and stripes" he was only quoting a member of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary. To the editor he told the truth. But to write that a certain labor leader quoted a member of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary as saying "To hell with the stars and stripes" would not make much of a story, but to say that a labor leader himself cursed the flag not only makes an excellent story but is serving your employer in the way he would be served.

Mr. Fitzpatrick shows his ignorance of newspaper methods in his letter. He wrote: "Take, too, the report of the Conference of Community Centers. What happened or what was said was practically unreported or reported only in driblets, except the alleged sensational remarks of Professor Beard."

Of course, Mr. Fitzpatrick. What does an editor care about reports? He and the members of his staff are always searching for sensations and the more they find the better noses for news they are supposed to have. I have known of societies whose members were sorry that they had invited reporters to attend their meetings, because justice was never done to the speakers. Only the sensational parts, and what were to them the most disagreeable parts, were taken out of their places and featured. A peaceful meeting may not get a line; a meeting that breaks up in a riot may get a column or more. But is the reporter to be blamed for all this? You may blame the newspaper reader who must be shocked and fed with sensations and you may blame the newspaper proprietor who uses his paper as a weapon of private interests, but the reporter is only an humble and obedient cog in the machinery of newspaperdom.

H. P. S.

New York City.

Why Stop at Four?

SIR: Caspar Lang's charming argument against birth control ignores, I note with pleasure, the essentials of the case. His signature, I take it, is the pseudonym of an anonymous member of the academic middle class resident at one of the prairie universities and living in comparative comfort at, say, $2,500 a year. We may therefore touch on his case without impertinence.

Why in the name of delightful childhood should resentfulness to family limitation insist only on four children? Why not go on year by year producing an unbroken line of endlessly charming Felicias? Where is the logic which balks at birth control because two babies are middle class *mores*, but itself spaces out infants and incontinently stops at twice two?

The proponent of this passionate anarchy in the production of babies forgets the babies and the mothers. Martin Luther could stand by the death bed of a woman who had borne sixteen children in seventeen years and exclaim: "She could not have died better!" To-day we are not so ruthless. Some of us try to think of woman's right to live and to achieve a more varied personality than is possible during a continuous orgy of giving birth even to annual Felicias. Some try to remember that it has been proven by the actual count that the infant disease and death rate increases with the size of the family. I refer to Dr. Alice Hamilton's study in the Hull House region.

For the sake, then, of the happiness which we trust will belong to Felicia when she herself becomes a wife, for the sake of the joy and wellbeing she would now lose, were other Felicias to tread too swiftly on her heels, I would dissent from the idyllic unrealities of Caspar Lang's argument. I would borrow Felicia. She is my argument for birth control.

WILLIAM L. CHENERY.

Chicago, Illinois.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VERSE

"The Art of Life"

Before Horace Tripp had been married
A year and a half
He began to suspect
That "the art of life"—
As he handsomely called it—
Was rather beyond his technique;
His powers in sleight-of-hand
Were slight indeed.
Too many balls to keep in the air:
His wife, his baby, his grocer,
His landlord, his publisher,
His friends and enemies,
And all the rest of them.
He made many a sad slip,
And came to feel petulantly
That perhaps he was more or less
A dub.

So he bent himself over his desk
All the harder.
If he could not coördinate and control
The various people who made up
The elements of his daily existence,
All the more would he take a high hand
With the brain-folk
Who peopled his books.
These *had* to behave—
Had to do as he wanted.
Sometimes they dashed through adventures,
Calamities and contortions
In kingdoms remote and imaginary;
Sometimes they grubbed in the slums;
Again, they were clever and elegant criminals
In "society"—whatever the mode of the hour.
But, anyhow,
All jumped through the hoop,
At his lightest command;
And each work came out in the end
Just as the author had planned it,—
No bit in the teeth, and no balking.
'Tis the weak man, of course,
Who makes the best tyrant;
And Horace was ruthless.
Soon he came to look on himself
As a species of minor creator,
Grandiose and omnipotent,
In a world of his own.

It was not, however, the world
With which one perforce
Has everyday dealings.
Things listed and twisted.
His publisher carped—
Returns for them both became meagre;
And his father-in-law
Began to scowl his reproaches;
And all the next summer
Bettina, with little indifferent Wilfrid,
Spent at her parents' cool cottage
High in the pine woods of Michigan,
While Horace, left quite behind,
Just boarded. Next year
He gave up a flat;—
The butcher had shown some impatience;
His wife was now dressed by her mother;
Pew-rent and club-dues were far in arrears;—
So the three went to live
Under the roof and the eyes of the elders,
Who looked with great coldness
On what they called "scribbling,"
And begged him to drop it
For something more useful—
And profitable.

But Horace, he said, was an "artist."
Trained to his one line of work,
Stubborn and proud,
He declared that a man
Who could scheme an elaborate novel,
Shape it, slew it around,
And push it through to a suitable climax,
Was a deal of a chap, after all.
He heartily scorned
Those "real-estate operations"
On commissions from which
He and Bettina and Wilfrid
Were now kept a-going.
What need to put art into one's daily life
And its manifold problems?
No; he would place it high and dry
In vacuo,
In a row of symmetrical, well-finished novels,
Set in due order on the towering Shelves
Of Immortality.

Another lean year. His writings
Seemed to fall in with the whims of the day
Less than ever.
He was a humbug; the public,
Not knowing the fact, and yet feeling it somehow,
Gave him the go-by.
Bettina now added her prayers
To her parents' reproaches,
And Horace, a martyr,
"Gave up literature"—in a measure.
Drugging his deadly aversion
To business,
He found him a place
With his publisher,—
Yes, with his own;
For he had knack of a kind
That gave him a limited value
In certain practical fields:
He could proof-read and edit.
He became, then, a salaried cog
In a big and a busy machine.

His new chief had begun
As a publisher of wall-paper,
Uttering fields, friezes and dadoes.
Next he had added stationery;
Next, books and periodicals;
And now he was bringing out sparsely, each season,
Volumes of prose and of verse
In numbers sufficient

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To gild and to dignify
What choice ones called " trade."

Horace, at first, was quite lofty,
And often said, " Pooh! "
But he had, after all,
Some slight inklings of sense;
And before his first year was over
He hummed in a different measure.
He now saw " the business "
As a great feat
Of imagination and technique,
A towering, well-knit structure
Of many fine cantos;
And Theophilus M. Decker
As a high creative spirit,
Strong and compelling:
A man of mark, of poise, and of breadth;
Prompt and able in all his relations;
A prestidigitator
Of twenty times poor Horace's own power;
Deft at home with his wife and his family,
Agile and stout 'gainst his fellow-paladins,
Dextrous indeed with his hundreds of helpers,
Prompt with his royalties,
A pillar of the church,
A staunch column in the politics of his ward,
Keen and wary with the assessor,
And annually gathering in,
Despite difficulties and competition,
Eighteen and three-quarters *per cent*
For self, family, and the clan of the " house ";
Doing it easily, lightly,
And jocularly. . . .
" He's a magician! " cried Horace,
Elate with a promised promotion;
" Yea, he's an Artist! "

Horace advanced.
His wife can dress in high feather
From husband's own purse;
Her father smiles on him at last,
And little Wilfrid and Imogene
Are allowed to respect
Their immediate progenitor.
Horace now sits at a roller-top,
Twiddling his thumbs
And knitting his brows at young authors
Who, flighty and over-" artistic,"
Might, with a few slight concessions,
Do better,
Both for the " house " and themselves,
If only . . . .

HENRY B. FULLER.

Petals

The garden is drenched with dew,
Each drop has captured the dawn;
Suns purple and gold gleam through
From myriad blades on the lawn.
The trees, long rooted in gloom
Where slumberous winter has been,
Skyward toss branches abloom
Like dancers glad to begin.

HORACE HOLLEY.

La Chair et l'Acier

[NOTE.—" La Chair et l'Acier " appeared in a paper issued by soldiers in the trenches, *Les Imberbes,* which is printed by multigraph and counts forty-two copies to the issue. They call it *Les Imberbes* to avoid the title *Les Poilus,* which is the usual name for the trench papers. Also the men are mostly of the class of 1915, which means that many of them are beardless indeed. Jean Le Roy has attracted the attention of such men as Verhaeren and Debussy. When his first volume of verse, " Le Prisonnier des Mondes," appeared some months before the war, a number of the best reviews, including the *Mercure de France,* hailed him as one of the significant writers of the time. Le Roy then became interested in contemporary developments in painting, and much of his work just before the war was in the nature of essays in objective expression, the simple presentation of the thing seen being made to render the idea, with perhaps a line or two of *envoi* to furnish a clue to the thought, or perhaps without even that. During the earlier months of the war, Le Roy's regiment was simply in training. Later it held certain trenches in a region where the fighting was not of the most active, but last fall it took part —a heroic part as I hear from a different source—in the great attempt in Champagne.—WALTER PACH.]

Quand nous sentions nos muscles élastiques
soulevés de plaisir
à marcher sur les trottoirs lisses de Paris
ou l'été quand nous nous rejouissions dans l'eau
et quand nous laissions cuire
sur le sable notre peau,
au temps ou les membres semblaient
malgré le poids des voutes bleues, légers,
nous ne connaissions pas encore
la valeur de la fragilité
de la matière dont est bâti notre corps.

Pendant un grand bombardement
qui laissa notre dédale dévasté
couvert de cuivre, de plomb, d'acier
comme un enfer à fleur de champ,
j'ai compris clairement
ma chair
qu'une musique fait frémir
et que glace un souvenir
cher
J'ai vu l'enfant
tenant entre deux doigts
la sauterelle qui palpite et souffre et ploie,
petit morceau mobile, agile mais fragile.
* * *
Comme l'insecte, sont soumis
les corps précieux de mes amis
à la force sans pitié
des blocs d'acier
qui vont coupant avec une monstrueuse aisance
les chairs lisses et blanches et adolescentes
de ci de là
tombant d'en haut
et les squelettes
s'effondrent et les os
s'émiettent,
et le sang délivré s'échappe en noirs ruisseaux
* * *
Jeunes corps confiants jadis
Sur le bitume de Paris!

JEAN LE ROY,
(soldat de 1e classe).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Meekness of May

Harry, by the Author of Mrs. Jerningham's Journal. New York: Macmillan and Co. Price unknown.

READERS who are troubled and wearied by modern literature, and who long for that elder day when men were manly and women were womanly, will find peace in "Harry," a monodrama which appears to have been written in the early 'seventies of the nineteenth century, and of which the third edition, now lying before us, is dated 1877.

It is a story of young love and early marriage, of wedded life darkened suddenly by the shadow of crime and exile, and coming safely into light again at the last. The narrator is also the heroine, a young English girl named May, who agrees with Harry Vane, the hero, in thinking "'tis a matter of course girls should be woo'd and their lovers should woo." May is not a rebel. "They wish me at home to sit and sew," she says, "and I like to do what my aunt thinks right"—a taste which, there is only too much reason to fear, is dying fast. May is dutiful and clinging. "Ah, Harry!" her engagement prompts her to say, "I shall lean on you. I hope that you know I am very weak, only a poor little thing at the best." Her marriage, which she regards as one of those "beautiful compacts" that "glorify man," does not lessen her dutifulness. "Ought I to wish it, if he does not?" she asks herself. At a crisis, in sore perplexity, she reaches this decision: "I will first kneel down and will say a prayer, and then I'll ask Harry what I should think!"

How different would have been the married life of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Clayhanger if Hilda had been as meek as May!

Although May is almost uniformly submissive, her mood is not unreally clear. Sometimes in this book, as sometimes in life, we are not quite certain what the heroine means. For example, just after Harry's proposal and their first kiss, when May makes this reflection: "Instinct in vain with humanity strives." Her description of her own state of mind in the hour of marriage is equally free from artificial clearness:

> I stand on a rock where two rivers meet,
> With a life behind and a life before;
> And one is ebbing away from my feet,
> And the other is rising more and more.

The story is commendably free from attempts to gratify or to stimulate that interest in sex which pervades so much contemporary literature; although the author courageously does not blink the fact that after marriage Harry and May live in the same house. In only one passage is there a momentary danger that frankness will be carried too far. We refer, with regret, to the lines which are put into May's mouth, and which we are sure she would never have thought of without the author's aid, while she is dressing for dinner:

> Who is this man who may enter the room,
> Placidly certain his presence must please,
> Settle her colors, select her perfume,
> Hands in his pockets serenely at ease?

Even this passage, which might with advantage be omitted from a fourth edition, is partially redeemed by the use of the word "pockets," which would indicate that on this occasion Harry, at least, was fully clothed.

But we have kept our readers too long in ignorance of the answer to the question put by May: "Who is this man?" They shall be told in her own words:

> What *is* Harry like?
> Handsome and tall, with command in his eye,
> The sweetest of smiles giving sternness the lie;
> His soldierly bearing keeps foemen at bay;
> His hair is clipped close in the orthodox way;
> His nose has a curve from the bridge to the tip:
> A statue might envy his short upper lip.
> He dances divinely, and walks with an air
> Half autocratic and half debonair.

The first cloud, no bigger than the proverbial man's hand, appears over a dinner-table at the Grange, where Harry and May are guests. While the ladies are leaving the room she hears a man say, "The Captain has got an excellent start, but he won't set the Thames on fire, you know." Later in the evening May overhears another and more sinister reference to the same person: "Let us hope the Captain's wild oats are sown." Imagine her horror when she discovers later, alone at home with Harry, that "the Captain" is his nickname in the country! She tells him all, and although he bursts out laughing she cannot take so lightly the prediction that he will not ignite the Thames:

> I feel a strange chill steal into my heart—
> Should he permit such remarks from the crowd?
> Can it be their part? Can it be his part?
> They the mean snobs! he the noble and proud!

That little phrase "wild oats" should not be overlooked. May questions Harry about it. She asks him what the life of a man is like, and he tells her:

> "The life of a man, as it is and was,
> Is like autumn leaves decaying and dead,
> With a flavor of bad theatrical gas,
> And of last night's banquet," my husband said.

About himself Harry is humble, yet slightly evasive:

> "I am but a man, and a weak one too.
> My life has been full of confounded things,
> I am only a man like other men."

Making the manly plea that a man must do something, Harry falls to playing cards for money, of an evening, in his own house, but at the request of May, who thinks gambling "an alien thing in beautiful lives," and who would prefer a little prayer and Bible reading, he decides to abandon this habit. His decision is formed just after losing fifty pounds to two friends.

It is this decision, well-meant though it was, which leads to the catastrophe, for Harry soon begins to play billiards at his club in the near-by town. From billiards in the afternoon he sinks to billiards in the evening, and to dining at his club with friends. This practice, which is not very expensive, since "Harry conquers whenever he plays," has consequences of extreme gravity. We shall not spoil our author's story by telling it for her. Suffice it to say that one night, about ten o'clock, than which Harry never came home later, steps were heard on the path, but instead of Harry four men entered. May fastened her gaze on one of them:

> I stared at the man with my vacant eyes,
> That dreamily questioned him how he dared?
> And suddenly saw, with extreme surprise,
> It was a policeman at whom I stared.
>
> The five of us stood in the pleasant hall;
> And four were policemen, and one was I.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the end, as we have said, all ends happily. Harry, although driven from England by his belief that he is guilty of homicide, is finally convinced of his innocence, and returns to his native land. Thenceforth the life of the Vanes flows sweetly:

> My Harry has won such a patient mood,
> And has grown so resolute and so wise;
> He is always trying to do some good,
> And always succeeding in what he tries.

Lest the foregoing extracts have done an injustice to the author's style we subjoin a longer piece of sustained narrative. May goes out one evening, before her engagement, to pick a rose by starlight:

> Playing with fancies, in fanciful play,
> "If I want a rose," I demurely said,
> "I must look for an omen to point the way,
> And I must look for it over my head."
>
> So I found a star that shone in the sky,
> And marked how it glittered down on a tree,
> And felt—but I swear I know not why—
> There grew the roses intended for me!
>
> And as I approached the shadowy boughs
> That were spreading out over earth and air,
> A gay little miracle fate allows,
> And the star appears to be sparkling there!
>
> Gladly I ran o'er the daisy-clad plain,
> Led by the shimmering light of the star,
> And under the tree I found—Harry Vane
> Lying, and smoking a "mild cigar!"

Pedantic critics may complain, if they like, that such verse is free—free from the obligations which a nicer ear for rhythm would have imposed. The obvious answer is that the author's experience of life dictated her rhythms, and that she would have achieved nothing but artificiality and unreality if she had tried to squeeze this experience into stricter metres.

TIFFANY & CO.

PEARL NECKLACES
OF ALL SIZES

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

Secret Diplomacy

How Diplomats Make War, by Francis Neilson. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $1.50.

I SUSPECT that everyone who faces a prejudiced and hostile audience ends by overstating his case. Prejudice in the auditors begets contrary prejudice in the speaker. Thus when the anonymous author of the German book "J'accuse" seeks to convince his countrymen that they are wrong, he is less fair to Germany than are many British students of the war; and, similarly, the British author of "How Diplomats Make War" is so anxious to combat British prejudice against Germany that he becomes over-indulgent towards Germany and over-hostile towards England. Mr. Neilson, in a brilliant and eloquent account of the British diplomacy preceding the war tells us much about its disingenuousness. Yet the prevarications of Sir Edward Grey do not explain the Austrian note, nor Germany's refusal to mediate, nor her hasty ultimata to Russia and France. Accusing British diplomacy does not excuse the equally tortuous German diplomacy.

Perhaps this criticism is not entirely fair to Mr. Neilson. For unlike "J'accuse," which is an indictment of Austria and Germany and a defense of the Allies, Mr. Neilson's book is not primarily an attempt to judge between nations, as a governess apportions blame among her squabbling children. It is rather an attack upon the secret diplomacy, which, whether we hold it wise or stupid, brought England into war automatically and without the people having an opportunity to decide.

This indictment of British secret diplomacy cannot easily be quashed. Mr. Neilson dates the beginnings of the war from April, 1904, when the English and French Governments entered into a secret agreement concerning Morocco. In January, 1905, came a secret agreement looking to eventual conversations between British and French military and naval experts. In the same year Sir Edward Grey privately informed France that in his opinion if a certain situation arose with a certain Power, public opinion in England would rally "to the material support of France." There followed similar "gentlemen's agreements," "not binding," of course, but sufficiently well understood to persuade France to leave her northern coasts undefended. In other words, definite enough to be understood and indefinite enough to be denied. They were denied. Repeatedly, in answer to questions in the House, the government asserted that there was no "undertaking, promise or understanding" with France, no "obligation" to send troops to the Continent. Even Sir Edward Grey's admission in August, 1914, is couched in the terms of a denial.

It is, of course, not ultimately significant whether Sir Edward Grey prevaricated, paltered, or was merely disingenuous. What is at issue is the question whether a more open diplomacy, a taking of the people into the government's confidence, would not in the end have proved wiser

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more pacific. Clearly, when the great crisis came, England, being secretly pledged to France, was in an equivocal position. She seemed to have a latitude of action which in fact she did not have. Sir Edward Grey could not have fairly mediated, could not have accepted German bids for British neutrality, could not in short have done anything except be loyal to France. Would not his efforts for peace have been more effective if no agreement had been made with France, or if such an agreement had been made with the approval of the British public and therefore with the knowledge of Germany and Austria? Does not the indeterminateness of secret diplomacy foment wars?

Doubtless Sir Edward Grey, if confronted with all the arguments against secret diplomacy, might make a reasonably plausible defense. He might say that there are occasions when a brief secrecy is admissible. Incidents arise which a premature disclosure would magnify and distort. Moreover, the secret diplomat is not infrequently right, as Bismarck was right in the early 'sixties and the Prussian Parliament wrong. Perhaps in the years preceding the war Sir Edward was convinced of the vital necessity of England's assistance to France in any conflict with Germany—in order that France might not be crushed first and England later—and at the same time he may have held it impossible to bring this truth home to the British public, except as the result of a propaganda which would itself have made war more probable. To save the country, he may have argued, is more important than to take the country into your confidence. But such a defense of a ten years' policy of silence and deception on the part of popularly selected officials would be, like all defenses of secret diplomacy, profoundly anti-democratic. It is the old assumption that in foreign affairs Parliaments and the long-eared public are ignorant, vacillating, too bellicose, too yielding. In other words, hopeless.

Yet unless the public gets into the water, it will never learn to swim. There was a time when the British knew less of domestic affairs than they now know of foreign, and if they are ignorant it is because they are kept ignorant. Moreover the diplomats, though they understand diplomacy so well, are themselves ignorant. Their irresponsible secrecy leads to a purely technical approach to their problems, and to a mental opacity which exaggerates distrust and conceals real issues. Mr. Neilson's whole book is an illuminating study of this very phenomenon, the twisting of wills and obscuring of purposes amid the prejudices and immediate judgments of a long and secret diplomatic duel. As one finishes the book one gains the sense of the helplessness of these shrewd diplomats, marooned as it were on an island of silence. They seem not only isolated, but rashly weak, irresponsible, without the firm support that would come from the adhesion of a well informed nation.

To ascribe war to secret diplomacy alone, which Mr. Neilson, however, does not do, would be to overlook immensely powerful nationalistic and economic impulses, which drive men into the conflict. Secret diplomacy does not create the struggle but merely determines the manner in which it is to be fought. It is a two-edged weapon, turned against the enemy and against the pacific elements in one's own nation. Nevertheless it is a contributing cause. "Who then, makes war?" asks the London *Times* of Nov. 26th, 1912. "The answer," it continues, "is to be found in the Chancelleries of Europe, among the men who have too long played with human lives as pawns in a game of chess, who have become so enmeshed in formulas and the jargon of diplomacy that they have ceased to be conscious of the poignant realities with which they trifle. And thus will war continue to be made, until the great masses who are the sport of professional schemers and dreamers say the word which will bring, not eternal peace, for that is impossible, but a determination that wars will be fought only in a just and righteous and vital cause."

B. F.

Half-Preparedness

The Dangers of Half-Preparedness, an Address by Normal Angell. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 50 *cents.*

AFTER a year or so in the United States, Mr. Angell returned to England a few weeks ago because he happened to be just under the age limit for conscription. I do not know what the British government will do with him, whether it will order him to sweep up mines or run an automobile or become a clerk in a munition factory. But if there is one jot of wisdom in that government, it will invite Mr. Angell to the Foreign Office, give him a quiet room with a desk, and order him to think. To use a man with a brain like his in anything less than its highest capacity would be downright idiocy, as stupid as it would be to ask Hindenburg personally to lead a charge.

We have got it into our heads at last that soldiers cannot win a war, we have learned that industrial organization must exist behind the trenches. We have not got it into our heads that the most perfect army and the greatest economic technique is impotent if there aren't diplomatic brains behind them. With the failure of German preparedness staring them in the face those who pretend to lead the world have not yet learned the most obvious lesson. In America the more violent a man's enthusiasm for what he imagines is "preparedness," the less willing he is to give even a fraction of his mind to thinking out what preparedness is, the more suspicious he is of any one who puts the sane, the inevitable question: What are you preparing for? Mr. Roosevelt shirks it, Mr. Root shirks it, the defense leagues shirk it, even Major Putnam, who publishes Norman Angell's books and doesn't read them, shirks it. The preparedness enthusiasts will drill for their country, will sacrifice time and money for their country, will die bravely for their country. But they will not think for their country. They regard that as pacifism.

The truth is that the man who has not defined American policy, who does not know what policies are worth dying for, who has not estimated what force is likely to challenge those policies, is not fit to discuss preparedness. His judgment as to how large an army and navy we ought to have is worth just nothing at all, his opinion is built on nothing which deserves respect, and he has no more right to pile up guns and explosives than has a child or a madman. To arm without having gone to the trouble of examining and formulating a foreign policy is such dangerous nonsense that our descendants will rank it with the burning of witches, the laying on of hands, the inquisition of heretics, and the ritual of running amok. To realize the meaning of the question: Preparedness for what? is a test of sanity. It is as impossible to have preparedness without answering it as it is to secure nourishment without food.

The question has never been put more eloquently or more impressively than by Mr. Norman Angell in this published address. It is done with a skill and good humor and damaging logic unequalled, I believe, by any propagandist in the English-speaking world. What answer is there, for example, to this point:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "Here are two groups of nations, or two nations, likely to come to blows. How shall each party be secure, defend itself and preserve peace? And our statesmen in the profundity of their wisdom say, 'Each will be secure and properly defended if each is stronger than the other.'"

Or again what answer to this point based on a speech of Congressman Gardner's, which said:

> "If there had been no pacifist movement in Great Britain—if Lord Roberts had been listened to instead of Normal Angell, there would have been no war." . . . Then later in the same address: "If Great Britain in July, 1914, had said to Germany, 'We shall back up Russia if you fight her,' there would have been no war.'"

The Congressman can make these two statements untroubled by the fact that there is a flat contradiction, and naïvely unaware that the failure to listen to Norman Angell was the reason why England in 1914 did not know what her policy was, and was therefore unprepared. The thing for which Norman Angell pleads is not that there should be no soldiers but that there must be intelligent diplomats with an open foreign policy. The man who wishes to defend his country by arms and fails to understand the rôle of the diplomat is literally and exactly a militarist. He is following the course of Germany, which thought it could rely upon the best army the world has ever seen. That foolish faith was the essence of militarism and it has brought disaster.

The anti-militarist is not a man who believes in disarmament or in an inefficient army. Mr. Angell in fact says he would not even oppose conscription under some conditions. The anti-militarist is the man who says and means that military power must be the instrument of a political policy, that force for its own sake is no defense, that preparedness exists only when a people knows what it would fight for and has measured its weapons by that standard. To have no standard of armament except to be better armed than everyone else is a vicious futility, an invitation to ruin, and a crime against humanity. How many of our most respected citizens are advocating that crime to-day?

I don't know what chance there is of driving this truth home. If our preparedness agitators will not read and digest a book like this one of Norman Angell's, then reason and persuasion are almost bankrupt. Here is argument without threat, a chance for them to understand and pull themselves together. If they ignore it and all the pleadings of those who are willing to prepare only if the preparation includes a formulation of international policy, then the appeal will lie to the working men and farmers who instinctively distrust the armament propaganda anyway, who distrust its leaders, its backers, its motives and its temper. They can be raised against it and if sufficiently aroused they can stop it in its tracks.

The country will not be any the less "prepared." Whether it has a large army or a small one it is utterly unprepared anyway so long as its international relations have not been worked out clearly and with good faith. A nation which followed General Wood would be as defenseless as one which followed Mr. Bryan. The only difference between them is that Mr. Bryan wants a policy without armament and General Wood insists on armament without a policy. He who cannot grasp the literal truth of that assertion should be exiled to the wilderness and given time to think.

W. L.

DURAND
Steel Lockers

A DISASTROUS *fire* can easily start in an ordinary wooden locker. Put in an equipment of Durand Steel Lockers today and eliminate this source of *constant danger.*

Built entirely of steel, Durand Steel Lockers are *fireproof,* practically *indestructible, sanitary,* clean, convenient and will protect you against losses and confusion.

Infinitely better than any other type of locker and surprisingly inexpensive. Write today for our new catalogue.

We are also manufacturers of steel shelving, steel bins and general steel factory equipment.

DURAND STEEL LOCKER CO.
1506 Ft. Dearborn Bk. Bldg. Chicago — 906 Vanderbilt Bldg. New York

The Government Wants All Americans to Visit

Yellowstone National Park

Secretary Lane thinks all Americans should see our national parks. The Department of the Interior has published a book telling all there is to see in the Yellowstone, our greatest scenic domain.

Acting as distributors, the *Union Pacific* will send you a copy *free,* together with illustrated literature which tells what the Yellowstone trip costs, time required, how you may stop in Colorado and Salt Lake City, how Yellowstone Park is easily reached en route to California and North Pacific Coast. You want this great Government book, you need our concise travel book, to help plan your vacation.

GERRIT FORT, Pass. Traffic Manager
Union Pacific System
Dept. 133, Chicago, Ill. (380)

Life Insurance For Professors
By CHARLES E. BROOKS
Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Insurance in the University of California
A timely study of a question of interest to all salaried men
Price, paper 25 Cents
University of California Press, Berkeley, California

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany Defended

Germany Misjudged, by Roland Hugins. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. $1.00.

THOSE who view the European war as a clearly drawn conflict between good and evil, pacifism and militarism, democracy and autocracy, will find this little book very objectionable. As one might infer from the title, it attempts to exculpate Germany from the charge of having alone willed this war. An impartial weighing of the facts, according to the author, will distribute the blame with a fair degree of uniformity. The war began as a struggle over the balance of power in the Balkans, with Russia clearly the aggressor. France was dragged in by her unholy alliance and her Russian investments. England was dragged in by her secret commitment to France, not by her indignation over the violation of Belgium. That unfortunate country was crushed because it lay between the mighty forces of the two great groups of Powers. Belgium, as Professor Usher has pointed out, is not neutral ground and cannot remain inviolate in a conflict of world magnitude. Whether Belgium was actually neutral in her policy mattered little. Mr. Hugins accepts the German view that Belgium was in fact committed to England and France in the event of a conflict between those Powers and Germany.

In making out his case for Germany, Mr. Hugins works over materials that have yielded much the same results at the hands of Lowes Dickinson, Brailsford, and Bernard Shaw. One may be fairly certain that this kind of verdict lies nearer to the judgment that history will pass upon the war than the various highly colored demonstrations of German lust for world dominion. Mr. Hugins stands with a very small minority of American writers, those who find an element of justice in the German cause. But the number of American writers who have taken pains to acquaint themselves with the diplomatic history of Europe in the last decade before the war is an exceedingly small minority. And it can hardly be disputed that familiarity with the various phases of European diplomacy is essential to a judgment not based upon purely sentimental loyalties. Such loyalties are not to be ruled out, to be sure. Mr. Hugins is not free from them. He is not so neutral as he appears to himself. In case of doubt he favors Germany, chiefly in reaction to the mass of writing on the subject, which favors the Allies even in cases where there is little doubt. But the defender of Germany, in face of the general detestation aroused by her conduct in this war, ought to seem entirely free from bias, if he wishes to be effective.

Now, CYPRESS, the Wood Eternal, is the Champion Pergola lumber—you can see why. The same goes for arbors, trellises, sleeping balconies, (dahlia stakes might be mentioned) and pasture fences. Also for Colonial doorways. Likewise barns. Not to mention Library Interiors (with sugi finish) and humble kitchen sinks that don't warp. CYPRESS is "some wood," all right.

All-round Helps Department

Southern Cypress Mfrs.' Ass'n

1255 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, La.
1255 Heard Nat'l Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

NEW WARS FOR OLD

By

John Haynes Holmes

Minister of the Church of the Messiah (Unitarian), New York City, author of "The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church," "Marriage and Divorce," "Is Death the End?" etc.

A statement of Radical Pacifism in terms of Force versus Non-Resistance, with special reference to the facts and problems of the Great War.

From the Table of Contents

A Statement of the Problem
The Logic of Force
The Fallacies of Force
The Meaning of Non-Resistance
Exemplars of Non-Resistance (Ancient)
Exemplars of Non-Resistance (Modern)
The Practicability of Non-Resistance
Is War Ever Justifiable?
Is Permanent and Universal Peace to be Desired?
The Duty and Opportunity of America To-Day

"A Counterblast to Militarism" — *N. Y. Evening Post*

Price $1.50 Net

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY
443 Fourth Avenue - New York

Interlaken Summer Camp

MID-JUNE TO SEPTEMBER FIRST

Where boys grow strong in mind and body. 700 acre estate with 200 acres of woods and meadows. Land sports, hikes and camping amid the sand dunes. All kinds of water sports in 70 acre lake. The instinct in a boy "to make things" is strengthened by work in the iron, brass and copper shops of the ***Interlaken School***. Interesting experience in hay-making, harvesting and threshing on the 500 acres of Interlaken Farm. Leadership and initiative developed by boy government under trained men consulors. No extra charge for tutoring.

For Particulars and Catalog address

Director of Camp, Box 120, Rolling Prairie, LaPorte Co., Indiana

Chicago Representative - Phone Kenwood 4375

EAT AND BE WELL

By Eugene Christian, F. S. D.

23,000 cases furnished the material from which this book was written by America's foremost authority on dietetics.

This book answers the questions—
What shall I eat to be well?
How shall I eat to keep well?
What shall I eat to get well?

One hundred and forty pages of sound advice for $1.00

ALFRED A. KNOPF
220 West 42nd Street, New York

Send for a list of BORZOI BOOKS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED